

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1319
19 July 1967

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTEEN HUNDRED
AND NINETEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 27 June 1967, at 3 p.m.

<u>President:</u>	Miss BROOKS	(Liberia)
<u>later:</u>	Mrs. ANDERSON (Vice-President)	(United States)

1. Examination of conditions in New Guinea (continued)
2. General Assembly resolutions on the question of the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua (resolutions 2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI)) (T/L.1127) (continued)
3. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1121 and Add.1, L.1125)

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN NEW GUINEA (continued)

GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS ON THE QUESTION OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA AND THE TERRITORY OF PAPUA (resolutions 2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI) (T/L.1127) (continued))

The PRESIDENT: Yesterday the representative of the Soviet Union submitted a draft resolution concerning New Guinea, which may be found in document T/L.1127. I call on the representative of Australia to speak on this draft resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): In expressing my astonishment that a draft resolution such as this one should be placed before us here or before any body of the United Nations under the circumstances which obtain in the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, which my delegation and I have endeavoured patiently to explain at length and in detail, with all the honesty that it was possible for us to muster, I feel obliged to revert to a statement I made earlier in the debate on Papua and New Guinea. I referred to that statement yesterday when the representative of the Soviet Union said that the Administering Authority and the representatives of the Administering Authority had submitted no report on the implementation of the resolutions referred to here. I said then that General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI) was a bad resolution in this respect, that it either took no cognizance of clear and unequivocal facts vital to the development of New Guinea or implicitly or explicitly distorted those facts or asserted the existence of facts which are not indeed facts.

Then it will be recalled that I took the operative paragraphs of that resolution one by one in those terms. With regard to operative paragraph 1, the situation has been made clear here many times. Self-determination and independence, or whatever may be the result of self-determination, is recognized by my Government as a right to be exercised by the people of Papua and New Guinea when they wish to do so. I also said that operative paragraph 2 ignored the extraordinary progress and efforts which had been and are being made in New Guinea, and reiterates implicitly the paramountcy of the freely expressed wishes of the people, a subject to which I have addressed myself continually, in clear and unequivocal fashion. I said that operative paragraph 3, relating to resolution 1514 (XV), had as its core the freely expressed wishes of the people. I referred to the ample testimony of the efforts made by the Australian Government to give a means for the expression of those

wishes to the people of Papua and New Guinea, and to our pledges to those people that those wishes would be given full weight whenever the people wanted to express them. I said that operative paragraph 4 of that resolution referred to discriminatory electoral qualifications, and I went on to say that I had patiently explained that these do not exist and that the educational qualification which is retained in a few electorates at the express wish of the people themselves leaves the election open in the areas concerned to people of all races.

I went on to say that with regard to discriminatory practices in the economic, health and educational fields, to which reference is made in that resolution, I would not deny that those who seek individual instances of discrimination in New Guinea, as in any other country in the world, including the Soviet Union, can find them.

What I did say was that in the generality of their efforts, the people of Papua and New Guinea are working together on a basis of mutual respect and equality before the law and that discrimination is not only outlawed, not only subject to the penalties of the law, but at this very moment is receiving the earnest attention of the House of Assembly itself so that the most positive state of equality in all circumstances can be reached in the shortest possible time.

I went on to say that this equality related to equality not only between people of European origin and New Guinea origin on the one hand, but also between the people of all races and tribes in New Guinea.

I went on to refer to the passage in the resolution which demands the holding of elections based on universal adult suffrage. I said that that has been done, that it is being done, and that it will continue to be done.

I must confess that in the face of such a clear and unequivocal fact -- a fact not because I say it is a fact, but because it exists on the ground -- the persistence in reiterating that kind of charge literally amazes me. I would go further and say that if all the Member States of the United Nations could point as clearly and as unequivocally to a system of democracy based on universal franchise and on a common roll as can be done with regard to Papua and New Guinea, I would be literally amazed.

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

Then I referred to the fixing of an early date for independence. I said not only that the people of New Guinea will do this in their own way and in their own good time, but that they know and have been repeatedly told that they can do this. The United Nations knows as well as I do that they have been told and that they know they can do this.

Against that very brief background and recapitulation, let me address myself particularly to one or two paragraphs of the draft resolution now before us. The sponsor of that draft resolution, the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, would have the Trusteeship Council condemn the Administering Authority for its refusal to implement certain General Assembly resolutions.

First, as I have clearly explained, there has been no refusal. Secondly, the use of the word "condemns" in those particular circumstances, and in all the circumstances obtaining in Papua and New Guinea, is nothing less than a cynical prostitution of the language of the Charter of the United Nations and of the purposes which are enshrined in that Charter. My colleague from the Soviet Union knows as well as I do the degree of the verbal prostitution that is involved in the use of that word.

Then to follow a paragraph like that one with a paragraph beginning with "Urges" -- seeking first to condemn and then to urge -- shows a complete lack of understanding of how human minds work and certainly of how nations work and should work.

I challenged the representative of the Soviet Union in this Council to contradict the statements I made regarding the validity of the Charter, on the one hand, as the law of the United Nations, and the validity of the resolutions of the General Assembly, on the other hand, as the law of the United Nations. He chose to ignore that challenge. I said then: "While my Government has given the most serious consideration to these resolutions, as to other resolutions of the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations, its basic position rests, and will continue to rest, on the Charter of the United Nations, and, in relation to its Trust Territories, on the Trusteeship Agreements freely concluded between the Government of Australia and the United Nations, with the full agreement of the then Members of the United Nations, including the Soviet Union." I continued: "In this connexion, I take leave to doubt, despite the agile semantics

which our colleague from the Soviet Union has indulged in here, that there is any basic difference of opinion on the theory involved between my delegation and that of the Soviet Union." I said: "If this difference does exist, if in fact my colleague from the Soviet Union is prepared to turn his back upon the Charter and substitute for the law of the United Nations, represented by that Charter, resolutions of the General Assembly, then I would be interested to hear him say so."

That same representative, sanctifying certain resolutions of the General Assembly, turned his back on resolution 1541 (XV) yesterday because someone dared to mention it. If there is validity in one resolution of the General Assembly, why is there not the same validity, Mr. Shakhov, in all the resolutions of the General Assembly, including the list of resolutions which the Soviet Union has never implemented, never intended to implement and never will implement?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I have asked to speak in order to make a few comments on the draft resolution contained in document T/L.1127. In its essence and spirit, my delegation is in agreement with that draft resolution, but, in all fairness, we do not think the time has yet come -- and we hope it never will -- when we should condemn the Administering Authority. We are in full agreement with the wording of the last paragraph of the preamble, which reads:

"Noting with deep regret that the Administering Authority has not yet taken the necessary steps to implement General Assembly resolutions 2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI)."

Therefore, my delegation would like, in departing from the rules of procedure by not formally submitting an amendment, to request the indulgence of the representative of the Soviet Union to help make it possible for us to vote for that draft resolution by deleting operative paragraph 2.

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): I have no wish to intervene in this discussion beyond explaining the reasons why my delegation will not be able to support the draft resolution, whether or not the suggested amendment of the representative of Liberia with respect to operative paragraph 2 is accepted.

The last paragraph of the preamble and operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution refer to the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI). When those resolutions were before the two preceding sessions of the General Assembly, my delegation voted against them because, in our view, they ignored the facts of the situation and they ignored the principle set out in the Charter and reflected in resolution 1541 (XV), namely that it is according to the expressed wishes of the people that their future must be decided.

(Mr. Posnett, United Kingdom)

I said in my statement during the general debate that in so far as there may be inconsistency between this general consideration and paragraph 4 (d) of resolution 2227 (XXI), the Administering Authority had, in the United Kingdom delegation's view, chosen a course which complied with the principle set out in the Charter that the interests of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories are paramount.

My delegation has already in the course of the general debate given reasons why it considers that resolution 2227 (XXI), to the extent that it can be implemented, has in fact been implemented to the full by the Administering Authority, and I do not propose to repeat these reasons. We take the view that the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution before us, together with operative paragraphs 2 and 3, to which I have referred, are nugatory. We consider that the draft resolution, taken as a whole, is superfluous and we shall vote against it.

Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America): My delegation wishes to make it clear that it is opposed to the draft resolution which is now under consideration, and will vote against it, either with or without the amendment. It seems to my delegation that the Trusteeship Council expressed itself yesterday much more fully and accurately on this whole subject, and to adopt a resolution today the spirit of which is contradictory would certainly be unnecessary and it would actually to a large extent undo the action we took yesterday. Therefore, the United States delegation will vote against this draft resolution.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I do not intend to go into any detailed discussion of this question, as our time is too limited for this. However, I should like to make certain comments both on the draft resolution itself and on the statements made here in the Council, particularly the statement made by the Australian representative. The language to which the Australian representative had recourse in his statement is not by any means in accordance with our standards and the position occupied by the representative of Australia. I would not even dare, at my age, to repeat

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

the expressions which he uttered here in the Trusteeship Council. Such words could perhaps be used in the market-place, but not in the Trusteeship Council.

Regarding the substance of the matter, I have already explained, but I should like to reiterate this, that the Australian representative tried to depict matters as if the Soviet Union, by submitting this draft resolution, is turning its back on the Charter of the United Nations, as he expressed it, and is replacing it by resolutions. Then he asked why, if we insisted on the implementation of those resolutions, we rejected resolution 1541 (XV). I must declare that the draft resolution T/L.1127 is entirely in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, particularly Article 76, which makes it binding on the Administering Power to take all the necessary steps in the field of economic, political and social development and also to undertake the necessary steps to lead the peoples of the Trust Territories to self-determination and independence. This provision of the Charter, as is known, was then reflected subsequently in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in resolution 1514 (XV), which is the fundamental document in the field of decolonization.

The resolutions which were subsequently presented in the United Nations, resolutions 2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI), were completely derived from the Charter of the United Nations and followed upon resolution 1514 (XV), the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Soviet draft resolution demands the implementation of these resolutions.

Therefore, the assertion of the representative of Australia that the Soviet Union is turning its back on the Charter of the United Nations is absolutely invalid, and I can in no wise agree with this assessment. I can only say that the opposite is the truth, and that the representative of Australia is really embarking on a course of rejecting resolutions passed by the General Assembly and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, because the actions of the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory are such that they show that the administering Power -- I would stress this -- does not have even approximate plans to establish independence in the Trust Territory of Papua and New Guinea and that it does not intend at all to do this. The Administering Authority simply refers

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

to false arguments that it is acting in accordance with the wishes of the people. But what will of the people can we speak about, when these people are under colonial dependence, when they are under colonial domination, and when they do not have the right freely to express their views about their future, when there are no conditions in the Territory which would allow an expression of their will on the part of the population?

Therefore, what was said by the representative of Australia and the representative of the United Kingdom is in itself a cynical prostitution in their utilization of references to the Charter in this way. May I be allowed also to use this term which was indulged in by the Australian representative?

Regarding the explanations which were given here regarding the question of discrimination, the statement of the Australian representative confirms the fact that there is discrimination in the Territory, both in the economic field and in other areas, as there is discrimination in the field of electoral legislation, and this was not refuted by the representative of Australia. He did, of course, attempt to show that the educational qualification is something that is wished for by the people themselves, but you, the civilizers, have been holding sway in the Territory for fifty years, and essentially you have done nothing up to the present. Regarding the Australian representative's references to what happened in the Soviet Union and his hints that in the Soviet Union there is a certain discrimination, I would categorically refute this.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

Only a society which is based upon public ownership, where there is no exploitation of one class by another; only a society where there is no exploitation of man by man -- only this sort of society -- which, I am proud to say, we have built in the Soviet Union -- can achieve equality among people. Every citizen of the Soviet Union possesses absolutely equal rights and privileges in our society. Everything depends on the capacity of the individual, not on his sack of gold -- on whether he is rich or poor. It depends on his capacity to serve the common cause. So when the representative of Australia spouts off about equality in the Soviet Union, I must categoricllly refute what he says.

Regarding the request of the representative of Liberia, I regret that I cannot accept his request. If the representative of Liberia cannot vote for this paragraph, he might ask for a separate vote on it.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): My Soviet colleague has referred to the language to which I had recourse in speaking to this draft resolution. Not only was it very proper English, but it was an attempt to convey to the representative of the Soviet Union an understanding which other forms of language, expressing facts, have failed to convey. If it was in fact -- which it was not -- "the language of the marketplace" -- to use his own terms -- then, possibly, that is because that is the language the sponsors of a draft resolution such as this could understand.

He has skilfully avoided and distorted the point raised by my reference to the Charter and the General Assembly resolutions. Let me repeat what I said: I did not say that the Soviet Union was turning its back on the Charter. What I did say was exactly and precisely this: I take leave to doubt, despite the agile semantics which our colleague from the Soviet Union has indulged in here, that there is any basic difference of opinion on the theory involved between my delegation and that of the Soviet Union; and I continued in percisely these words: If this difference does exist, if, in fact, my colleague from the Soviet Union is prepared to turn his back upon the Charter and substitute for the law of the United Nations, represented by the Charter, resolutions of the General Assembly, then I should be interested to hear him say so.

Those are the words I used previously; those are the words I used only a few minutes ago; and those are the words I use again in relation to the reference to the Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly which our colleague from the Soviet Union has just mentioned.

I apologize for taking up the time of this Council; I shall be brief. But with regard to the assertion of the Soviet representative that the people of Papua and New Guinea have been denied the right to express their opinions, this, again, is a flagrant mis-statement, in total contradiction of all the facts of the situation. And I do not do the intelligence of my colleague from the Soviet Union the insult of thinking that he does not know it.

There is -- and I am tired of hearing my voice say this -- a universal franchise, a common roll, and a freely elected Parliament; there is no restriction on freedom of speech in Papua and New Guinea or in Australia; nor any restriction on freedom of association or freedom of expression. And if my colleague from the Soviet Union can say the same thing about his country, regarding which he has painted such a rosy picture, then I will be very pleased to hear his statement supported by facts.

He attempts also to distort my statement about discrimination. The statement was: I would not deny that those who seek individual instances of discrimination in New Guinea, as in any other country of the world, including the Soviet Union, can find them. But what I said was that in the generality of their efforts, the people of Papua and New Guinea are working together on the basis of mutual respect and equality before the law, and that discrimination is not only outlawed, not only subject to the penalties of the law, but is, at this very moment, receiving the earnest attention of the House of Assembly itself so that the most positive state of equality in all circumstances can be reached in the shortest possible time.

That is what I said -- not the admission into which our colleague from the Soviet Union attempted to distort that statement; and I must confess, in conclusion, in the light of the facts, some of which I am prepared to quote, that I take leave to doubt his statement that in the Soviet Union such a set of Garden of Eden conditions exists that he can deny what I have said.

Mrs. Anderson (United States of America) took the Chair.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to ask the representative of Liberia whether he wishes to put forward his suggestion as a formal amendment, to be voted on, or whether it was merely a suggestion.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Yes, my proposal was formal. I suggested that the representative of the Soviet Union accept it, but if he did not I intended it to be formally proposed in this Council.

The PRESIDENT: Since the suggestion was not accepted by the representative of the Soviet Union, we will vote at this time on the amendment proposed by the representative of Liberia.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Perhaps it might save time if, when we come to the draft resolution, we voted on operative paragraph 2 separately.

The PRESIDENT: We shall vote first on the draft resolution, up to and including operative paragraph 1 -- in other words, on the preamble and operative paragraph 1.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I am somewhat confused as to what we are voting on. Since there is a proposal to delete operative paragraph 2, I should have thought that that proposal, as one far removed from the original intent of the whole draft resolution, should be voted on first.

The PRESIDENT: As I understand it, the representative of Liberia asked only for a separate vote on operative paragraph 2, and that will be taken. At present we are voting on the paragraphs of the preamble and operative paragraph 1.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): The representative of Liberia is of course entitled to ask for a separate vote on this paragraph, as on any other paragraph, but this does not necessarily involve a separate vote on other sections of the draft resolution. This is, I think, part of the point that the representative of New Zealand was trying to make. I would suggest that the procedure would be to take the separate vote on the paragraph and then vote on the draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: That was what I had proposed in the first place, but out of deference to the representative who sponsored the amendment, I yielded to his suggestion. However, since there seems to be some misunderstanding about this, I think that we should first take a vote on operative paragraph 2. Therefore we shall now vote on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

Paragraph 2 was rejected by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was rejected by 6 votes to 2.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I wish to explain my vote very briefly since I have not had an opportunity to do so before.

The basis of the New Zealand vote was our feeling that in fact the tendering of this draft resolution after the adoption yesterday of the detailed report covering all these points was superfluous. We also have substantive objections, particularly the failure to take into account the freely expressed views of the people, which views were expressed in this Council by two people elected freely by their peers.

At the same time I should like it to be placed on record that the New Zealand vote can in no way be represented as a vote against the principle outlined in operative paragraph 1.

The PRESIDENT: As members of the Council are aware, the Council has considered this item with the examination of the Administering Authority's annual report on the Territory. During that consideration the Council heard the Administering Authority's statement on the subject, discussed it, and adopted conclusions and recommendations on it. These are to be found in chapter VI, the chapter on New Guinea, with which we have been dealing. I would suggest that, in its report to the General Assembly, the Council should draw attention to the action which it has taken and to the observations that have been made in the course of the debate, in response to the Assembly's request. That could most appropriately be done in the chapter on Attainment of Self-Government or Independence, in the Council's report to the Assembly.

It was so decided.

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS: REPORT
OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.1121 and Add.1, L.1125)

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now turn to consideration of the report of the Drafting Committee on examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This report is contained in document T/L.1125.

I call on the representative of France to introduce the report.

It appears that the representative of the United Kingdom wishes to introduce the report.

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): It is in no sense because I wish to deprive my colleague from France of the privilege of introducing this report that I speak now, but, if I may say so, with his concurrence.

I want to draw attention to only one or two general points in the layout of our report before the Council begins its detailed consideration of the contents. These points have been made necessary, in our view, by changes in the situation and in the progress achieved in the Trust Territory.

Paragraph 4 is entitled "Land questions". The similar paragraph last year was entitled "Land claims". In the report of the Visiting Mission there is a long section concerning land problems in the Territory. It goes a great deal further than simply discussing claims against the Administration. There has also been a great deal of development in the Territory itself in this regard: the establishment of a new organization to deal with land matters, and the passing of a public law by the Congress of Micronesia, setting up a commission to deal with land. For these reasons, we wished our conclusions on this subject to have a wider connotation than simply that of claims. We therefore propose a change in the title.

In another context, the Drafting Committee felt, on the basis of speeches made during the debate here, that many delegations attached great importance to constitutional developments in the field of the executive. We have, as the Drafting Committee, included in our report, at paragraph 12, a paragraph headed "The Executive". There was no such heading last year, but we felt that the situation in the Trust Territory now had advanced to the stage where it was necessary to give particular attention and to draw particular notice to this matter.

(Mr. Posnett. United Kingdom)

I would, however, apologize to the Council for the fact that, owing to the haste with which this report was prepared, this paragraph appears in the wrong place. Instead of appearing as paragraph 12 it should have appeared as paragraph 9, following paragraph 8 in the political section. It would have the sub-heading "(c) The Executive". The following sub-heading would then become "(d) Local Government", and the first paragraph under that sub-heading would be numbered 10.

The title "Local government" is in itself new. Last year the similar title was "District Legislatures and Local Government". Here we thought it patent that "Local government" is a general and a generic term which includes district and municipal legislatures and governments, and that it was better in the title to use the general term to cover all forms of local government.

We have introduced a new title at sub-heading (f), "Peace Corps". This again is an obvious result of the developments in the Territory, where great changes are occurring and are expected to occur as a result of the new policy adopted by the administering Power. We thought it necessary to bring this out by having a separate heading for this subject which would ensure that it was not lost sight of.

There are also, I must confess, in this report one or two minor typing errors and one or two slight omissions, and with your agreement, Madam President, and with the agreement of the Council, I would prefer to draw attention to these as we come to the paragraphs concerned.

With those brief comments, my colleague and I offer this draft for consideration by the Council. In so far as we can be of help in furnishing explanations for the reasons why we have adopted any particular formulation or wording, we shall be glad to try to do so.

The PRESIDENT: Unless there is a suggestion from any delegation to the contrary, I intend to ask the Council to take up the draft conclusions and the recommendations contained in the annex paragraph by paragraph, beginning with paragraph 1 of the annex.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to make a statement to explain my vote on the document as a whole and on individual paragraphs thereof. I believe this will facilitate our work, and we could perhaps proceed as we did last time. Therefore, I should like to have the opportunity to speak to the report as a whole and to individual parts of it, and I shall mention which paragraphs the delegation of the Soviet Union thinks should be voted upon separately.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I would suggest that, in the interest of saving time, perhaps a better approach would be to vote separately only on those paragraphs for which a separate vote is requested, and otherwise to vote on the report as a whole. I think there is no contradiction between the suggestion just made by our colleague from the Soviet Union and the suggestion that I make myself. I understand him to say that he will have observations on particular paragraphs and will be asking for separate votes on particular paragraphs. If any other delegation wishes separate votes on particular paragraphs, it is of course quite open to that delegation to ask for such votes. I would suggest that the procedure I have indicated might be followed with benefit

Mr. MCDOWELL (New Zealand): There are one or two paragraphs on which my delegation would like to have a separate vote. If the procedure suggested by the representative of Australia is followed, we would like to be able to indicate those paragraphs.

The PRESIDENT: We might follow this procedure. We will consider the report section by section. At that time, if any delegation wishes a separate vote on any particular paragraph in a section, a separate vote will be taken on that paragraph.

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): I understood the procedure would be to consider the report paragraph by paragraph, but not necessarily vote on each paragraph. It might be adopted without objection, as I believe was the situation last year in many cases. Paragraphs, however, would be considered one at a time. This seems to be the procedure which has been followed in the past. I understood that the objection was to the voting rather than to the consideration.

There are a number of small amendments that I shall have to present. I think it would be convenient if we were simply to consider the report paragraph by paragraph, but not necessarily to vote on each paragraph unless a member called for a vote. Is this procedure possible?

The PRESIDENT: As I understand it, that is the procedure that we intend to follow. If the representative of the United Kingdom wishes to submit small changes or corrections at the beginning of our consideration of each section, he will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Before the Council proceeds to vote on the paragraphs or sections of this report, the Soviet delegation would like to make a general statement on the report as a whole. At the same time, we should like to indicate those paragraphs in the report which we consider should be voted upon separately. This is the procedure which the Council followed yesterday and which I consider should be observed today. In any case, the Soviet delegation insists that it

be given the opportunity to make a general statement on the report and to explain the way it is going to vote on the report as a whole and on its individual paragraphs.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union may certainly make his statement on the report as a whole, but I would suggest that he follow the procedure which has been agreed upon, that is, to vote section by section. As we come to each section, if he wishes to call for a separate vote on a particular paragraph, he may do so at that time, but we do not have to have a preliminary explanation from the representative of the Soviet Union in that respect.

In accordance with his request, I give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union to make a general statement.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The characteristic feature of the report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands contained in document T/L.1125 is the fact that the Committee evades a solution of the main problems faced by the Trusteeship Council. The conclusions and recommendations which appear in the report refer to secondary issues regarding developments in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The report confines itself to noting the statements made by the Administering Authority with regard to its plans in the fields of economic, political and social development, or to noting certain facts in certain areas, for example, that elections have been held in the Territory, what items were considered by the Congress, how long the session lasted, etc.

In the report there are certain recommendations with regard to the need to enact insignificant reforms regarding the organization of the work of the Congress of Micronesia which decreases its authority on questions such as considering the budget of the Territory, etc., but we believe that the main issue is circumvented in this report; that is, that the Congress of Micronesia does not possess any legislative rights, that everything in the Territory is decided upon by the representative of the administering Power, and that the

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

Congress has become simply a deliberative body attached to the High Commissioner in whose hands are concentrated all the legislative and executive authority.

The authors of the report convey essentially the statements made by the Administering Authority to the effect that the people of the Territory have not yet reached a stage where they can pronounce themselves about their future political status. Here emphasis is clearly laid on justifying the colonial thesis that the population is not prepared in the political and economic fields for self-determination and independence.

With regard to the right of the people to self-determination, including the right to independence, in the recommendations of the Drafting Committee there is reference made to resolution 1541 (XV), which contains, as you know, certain provisions which make it possible for the Administering Authority to annex this Territory. This is something with which the Soviet delegation cannot agree.

With regard to the recommendations in the field of economic development in the Territory and also in the field of health and education, attention is concentrated on secondary issues, on the enactment of certain insignificant reforms to which hardly anybody would take exception. But there has been no reflection in the recommendations of such problems as the complete economic isolation of this Territory from the rest of the world, the pressure exerted in the Territory by foreign monopolies and the widespread alienation of land by the Administering Authority from the indigenous inhabitants which, according to what was said by a member of the Congress of Micronesia, Mr. Salii, retards the economic development of the Territory and deprives the indigenous population of the possibility of participating in the economic life of the Territory.

We should like to add that the activities and plans of the Administering Authority to turn the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands into its own strategic military base and into a base for aggressive actions against national liberation movements in Asia, particularly in South-East Asia and primarily against the people of Viet-Nam was specially overlooked by those who compiled the report.

The conclusions and recommendations which appear in the draft report from the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council and the report of the Drafting Committee completely ignore the decisions taken by the General Assembly in its resolutions 2105 (XX) and 2189 (XXI), which call upon the Administering Authority to abolish their military bases in colonial territories and not to establish new ones.

All this forces us to declare that the conclusions and recommendations presented by the Drafting Committee on the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are on the whole unacceptable to the Soviet delegation because they do not reflect the real situation in the Territory, which was pointed out by the Soviet delegation both in its general statement and during the discussions of the report of the Special Representative when questions were being asked of the Administering Authority and answers were given by it regarding the situation in the Territory.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

However, taking into account that the report contains certain recommendations which are addressed to the administering Power -- namely, that it take steps to improve the situation in the Territory in health, education, transport links among separate islands, and to a certain extent to expand the rights of the Congress of Micronesia to which I referred before, to promote representatives of the indigenous population to leading posts in the Administration and to decide the question of the claims of the inhabitants of the Territory so that damages be paid to them for what they suffered as a result of the Second World War -- the Soviet delegation will abstain from voting on certain sections of the report of the Drafting Committee.

At the same time, we should like to emphasize that a number of the sentences appearing in section 3 of the recommendations of the Drafting Committee, particularly the statement to the effect that the Trusteeship Council welcomes the plan for the economic development of Micronesia which has been prepared by the firm of Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc., are unacceptable to us. Without going into a detailed discussion of that plan, we should like simply to stress that that plan, far from promoting the development of those branches of industry in the Territory which were to make possible independent participation of the representatives of the indigenous population and to free the Territory from exporting products to the United States, merely provides for the complete subjugation of the economy of the Territory to American monopolists and its transformation into an appendage of the metropolitan country as well as a source of provisions necessary for their military bases in the Pacific and particularly in Guam.

In view of what we have said, the Soviet delegation will vote against paragraph 14 of the report of the Drafting Committee. We will also vote against paragraphs 24 and 25 of the report of the Drafting Committee, inasmuch as they seek to justify the colonialist thesis that the population is not ready for self-determination and independence, and inasmuch as the question of the right of the population to self-determination is tied to the economic dependence of the Territory on the United States, which is in disaccord with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

The Soviet delegation cannot support the reference in paragraph 26 of the report to General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV) of 15 December 1960, since, as we said before when discussing the report of the Drafting Committee on Papua and New Guinea, this resolution bears no relation to the question of trust territories and opens the door to the colonial Powers simply to annex these Territories under the pretext of integration.

These are our comments and this is the position we hold on certain recommendations of the report of the Drafting Committee regarding the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Therefore, we do not insist that a separate vote be taken on each of the paragraphs. The Soviet delegation would like to request, however, that we have separate votes on paragraphs 13, 14, 24, and 25 of the report, and that there be a separate vote on the phrase in paragraph 26 which reads "and resolution 1541 (XV) of 15 December 1960". The Soviet delegation will vote against those particular provisions.

Regarding the other provisions of the report, the Soviet delegation will abstain.

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): I should like to say only a few words in commenting on the statement which we have just heard from the representative of the Soviet Union. I am tempted to say, in thinking back over statements which I have heard the representative of the Soviet Union make in the last three or four years, that his statement strikes me as rather mild in this particular instance, and I am tempted to express some amazement at the mildness of it. At the same time, I am forced and obliged to say that his statement still contains the dogmatic views to which we have become accustomed in the period of time that the Soviet representative has been on the Council.

I think no one needs to be reminded here that the Soviet representative is somewhat inaccurate when he says that the report of the Drafting Committee avoids the main issue, and when he states that the main issue is that the Congress of Micronesia possesses no legislative powers and is only a part of the Administration. Two points I think refute that statement, or at least provide some commentary on it. One is that the Council has already seen a demonstration of the views

(Mr. McHenry, United States)

of the members of the Congress of Micronesia in the ability and willingness of those representatives to come before this Council and freely and openly state their views, some of which did not necessarily agree with the views of the Administering Authority. The second is that, knowing that the views of those representatives would not necessarily agree with the dogmatic views of the representative of the Soviet Union, he deliberately chose to avoid asking questions of those representatives for fear that they just might not agree with his preconceived notions of what is right and what is wrong, and what people ought to do or ought not to do.

As I think we have remarked before, I hope no one in this Council would raise the question whether Micronesia is or is not a self-governing or independent entity. I would hope that it is generally agreed that the very fact that the Council considers the question is an indication that it is a non-self-governing area, that it is a Trust Territory. And, therefore, it is not amazing, in fact it is not unusual, for us to recognize that the Congress of Micronesia does not possess complete and final authority over the area of Micronesia. Under both the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, this question, I think all will recognize, is left to the Administering Authority.

I need not comment now on resolution 1541 (XV). I think the representative of the Soviet Union has already shown his complete inability to explain why some resolutions of the General Assembly are to be accepted as sacred and others are to be completely ignored. The members of the Council heard the representative of Australia put this point to the representative of the Soviet Union on several occasions, and it takes no great energy to jog the memory so that one will recall that the question was to a large extent ignored. The point is that most members of this Council accept the fact that self-determination involves a choice of alternatives by individuals, and that it is not self-determination if a people is to accept the preconceived notions of any member of this Council, even the representative of the Soviet Union, as to what their form of government is going to be.

The Council has been assured by the United States representative on this occasion and on many other occasions that there is no limitation on the choice of the people of Micronesia as to their future form of government and that all options are open and will remain open as to their future political status. So we cannot accept the disparaging remarks which the representative of the Soviet Union has sought to make in his somewhat inconsistent effort to accept some resolutions of the General Assembly as holy and sacred and to reject others as being irrelevant.

With regard to certain factors that he stated were omitted from the report of the Drafting Committee, I must confess that I do not really understand his reference to the omission of economic isolation because it would seem to me that the Drafting Committee, even more than the representative of the Soviet Union, has taken into account the very real geographic, social and political factors which the Administering Authority must contend with every day in its administration of Micronesia. And economic isolation is one of them. It seems to me that the facts of economic and geographic isolation not only are very well reflected in the report of the Drafting Committee, but have also been reflected in the discussions of the Council.

With regard to the pressure of monopolies, I need only remind the representative of the Soviet Union that he raised this question previously during the questioning period and that at that time the representative of the United States referred him to that section of the report of the United States as the Administering Authority of Micronesia, which outlines in great detail what economic establishments exist in Micronesia and who owns them. If he had bothered to read that section of the report, he would have discovered that his accusations concerning economic monopolies had no place in his discussion of Micronesia, however large a place they may have in the dogmatic literature which he reads.

The Council may not recall this, but I recall very vividly that once before the representative of the Soviet Union either referred to, quoted or paraphrased a statement made by Mr. Salii, the representative of Micronesia, who was here. On that occasion Mr. Salii expressed his amazement in this Council -- and later privately -- that what he had said here could have been changed into what the representative of the Soviet Union had attributed to him.

I would imagine that if he had heard his words paraphrased once again, he would have again expressed amazement that what he had said originally had been twisted and turned as has just been done by the representative of the Soviet Union.

The Council will recall that with regard to the use of Micronesia as a so-called base of aggression, the representative of the Soviet Union has also raised this question previously. He was answered at that time. I have no idea what aggression he is talking about. I can only remind him that the Soviet Union, as a member of the Security Council, approved the Trusteeship Agreement under which the United States administers the Trust Territory, that the Soviet Union, as a Member of the United Nations -- indeed as a charter Member of the United Nations -- approved the Charter of the United Nations governing the administration of Trust Territories. He is also aware of the prerogatives may or may not exist under those documents.

There are no military bases in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Even if there were, I would remind him that his own Government has consented to the establishment of such facilities.

Let me close by saying that I do not think it is necessary to comment in detail on the Nathan Report. As regards its recommendations, the Council is aware that these are only recommendations. The Council is aware that the Nathan studies were undertaken because it was the view of the Council and of the Administering Authority that it was necessary to set forth a comprehensive economic plan for the Territory, and this was done in the Nathan Study. The Administering Authority has itself expressed some reservations about certain provisions of that study. But we shall take that study and review it as a whole and adopt recommendations in co-operation with the Congress of Micronesia, that is, the recommendations which the two parties agree are suitable for Micronesia.

I must say that in the final analysis we may find ourselves largely ignoring some of the dogmatic views of the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not intend to answer in detail the statement just made by the representative of the United States. We have heard such statements in the past with respect to his Government's position on the Pacific Islands, and we have also stated our own position on that question.

I should simply like to make two or three comments. The first comment concerns the rights of the Congress of Micronesia. The representative of the United States used that point very cleverly by saying that this Territory is a Non-Self-Governing Territory and that therefore it is quite natural that no authority should be granted to the Congress of Micronesia. However, I should like to remind him that the United Nations Charter exists. He referred to that Charter. That Charter states that the Administering Authority must take all the necessary measures in the field of political development which will promote self-determination, self-government and the advancement of the population to independence.

However, the powers and rights of the Congress of Micronesia are limited and have been limited from the very outset. The Congress of Micronesia has no powers to adopt any law unless that law is approved by the Administering Authority through the High Commissioner or the Secretary of Interior of the United States Government. Nobody can refute that fact. That particular point has been omitted from the report; in other words, the main point has been omitted. The Administering Authority has taken no measures to transfer to the people the authority over the Territory and nothing has been done to establish an executive authority in the Territory that would meet the requirements of a legislative body.

With respect to General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), I have already stated, and I shall repeat it now, that that resolution has nothing to do with Trust Territories. If the representative of the United States will examine resolution 1541 (XV) he will see that it does not relate to Trust Territories, but to Non-Self-Governing Territories and the submission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter.

As to the question of the choice to be made by the people concerning the course they are to take, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in other words resolution 1514 (XV), offers to the people the opportunity to decide for themselves questions related to their future status. By referring to resolution 1541 (XV), the Administering Authority reveals an aggressive tendency to annex the Territory by means of association or integration. It disregards the first part of that resolution which calls for the granting of independence to those Territories and it stresses the second part which refers to association or integration. In other words, under the pretext of integration it is trying to absorb the Territory which is under its administration.

With respect to the statements made by Mr. Salii, I do not recall that he refuted in the Trusteeship Council the statement made by the Soviet representative. Perhaps in a private conversation Mr. Salii said to the United States representative that the Soviet representative said something that was not completely in accordance with his view. But I want to state that I did not quote Mr. Salii. I simply set forth the substance of his statement. When I answered the representative of the United States at that time, I stated that, for very

understandable reasons, Mr. Salii could not draw the conclusions which the Soviet representative drew. He set forth the facts, but the Soviet representative drew conclusions on the basis of those facts.

With respect to the statement that the Soviet Union approved the Trusteeship Agreement and made no objection to that Agreement, that is a well known fact but it does not prove anything. It does not prove that the Soviet Union has given the Administering Authorities the right to utilize Trust Territories as an instrument of aggression against other peoples, which takes place, for example, in the case of Guam and New Guinea. Military bases on those Territories are used against the peoples of South East Asia, against the people of Viet-Nam.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have now concluded my statement.

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union has finished because he has put forth the implication that he wanted to put forth. But I think no one will ignore the fact that rather than attempting to prove his point of so-called aggression by referring to the subject of the discussion, which is the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, he has gone elsewhere to try to do so. I should simply like the record to show that we are not discussing any place except the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Although his statement on aggression was general, he was unable to cite any such case with respect to that area. If he has finished, I should like to exercise a general right of reply.

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

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): I think the last statement of the representative of the Soviet Union is proof positive of who is trying to be clever as far as the discussion here is concerned. I am sure that the Council understands that there was no intention on the part of the representative of the United States to say, and that in fact the representative of the United States did not say, that it was natural that the Congress of Micronesia did not have complete authority. Our statement was simply that it was natural that the Congress of Micronesia, and it was natural that Micronesia itself, was not totally self-governing. If it were totally self-governing and if the Congress of Micronesia had complete authority, then it would not be the subject of this Council. This is not to say that the Congress of Micronesia does not have a significantly larger measure of authority than the Council would be led to believe by the representative of the Soviet Union. It is clear that he chooses to ignore both the powers of the Congress of Micronesia and the fact that its representatives are enabled to come here freely to express their views.

I would simply remind the members of the Council that while the United States Government does not believe that it is necessary to wait until an institution is clearly inadequate before making basic changes, the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union in no way points to any indication that the present machinery in the Trust Territory with respect to the authority of the Congress of Micronesia is either inadequate or exhausted.

(Mr. McHenry, United States)

There are specific provisions for the Congress of Micronesia to exercise the power that it has, and the Soviet representative has not shown this Council that the Congress is unable to work within those provisions.

With regard to resolution 1541 (XV), I want to say no more on this point except simply to remind the members of the Council of one fact, the cleverness of the representative of the Soviet Union. He seeks to take refuge in this Council in the fact that resolution 1541 (XV) does not apply to Trust Territories, but applies to Non-Self-Governing Territories. We can only refer to the rather large amount of documents of other bodies of this Organization, which would show that in even these organs he again takes refuge and maintains that resolution 1541 (XV) does not apply to Non-Self-Governing Territories. That is why the accusation has been made here, and it has not been refuted, that the representative of the Soviet Union continues to accept some resolutions of the General Assembly and to reject others. Some are sacred, some are not. Some are to be implemented with regard to colonial questions, and some are not. Some are to be implemented with regard to other questions which are not the subjects of this Council, and some are not.

I do not think the Council would appreciate my continuing with this exchange, because I think that the tactics of the representative of the Soviet Union have become all too clear and that the Council can use its own judgement in separating dogmatic, propagandistic views from those which relate to facts.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): The statement of the representative of the Soviet Union was completely out of order when he made the reference he did to Papua and New Guinea in the context of the subject now before the Council. That reference having been made, however, I would remind the Council of the information that my delegation has painstakingly placed before it regarding the situation relating to whatever military preparations may be made in Papua and New Guinea and to the legality of these preparations under the Charter and under the Trusteeship Agreement.

I would further in particular remind this Council that Australia is not committed any acts of aggression against anyone anywhere, and, furthermore, that with regard to the references made about the use to which these military preparations in New Guinea were being put, I have already refuted many times what our colleague from the Soviet Union has said.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now turn to section I of the annex of T/L.1125.

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): In the third line of paragraph 4 of section I, "General", the Drafting Committee would like to insert after the words "the enactment" the words "by the Congress of Micronesia". This was an oversight on our part in the drafting, and on second thought we felt it would add clarity to the report if it were clear by whom this law was enacted.

Secondly, there is a typographical correction to be made in the same line. The word "provisions" should be singular.

A word has been omitted at the end of the fifth line of the same paragraph. It should read "the establishment of a new Office of Land Management".

Section I was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We will now turn to section II, dealing with political advancement. The Soviet representative has asked for a separate vote on paragraph 13.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I should like to make a proposal with regard to the second sentence of paragraph 5. As the Council is aware, the words "self-government" and "self-determination" are usually associated with the words "or independence". In the second sentence of this paragraph the drafters have elected to state: "self-government and self-determination". I think it would be more specific if we used the words "towards self-government or independence". I would therefore propose that the word "self-determination" be eliminated and the word "independence" be put in its place.

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): I am much indebted to the representative of Liberia for spotting this error, which in fact is another typographical error. The original draft stated "self-government or independence".

The PRESIDENT: The Chairman of the Drafting Committee has said it was a typographical error, and that the text should read: "towards self-government or independence". So there is no need to vote on the Liberian proposal.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): My delegation wishes to comment on paragraph 8 and new paragraph 9, which was formerly paragraph 12.

In regard to paragraph 8, we should just like to draw the Council's attention to the suggestion made in the New Zealand statement, that the Congress of Micronesia give consideration to holding a special session to consider the budget early in the year.

With regard to paragraph 9, which refers to the Executive, I should like to make a more formal proposal for the consideration of the Drafting Committee.

The third sentence of that paragraph contains some wording which I feel could possibly be slightly clarified. The wording is that "The Council notes with satisfaction the view of the Visiting Mission that some Micronesians are already capable of beginning to assume Cabinet-level responsibilities", and so on. I understand that these, in fact, are the exact words used by the Visiting Mission and, therefore, this is correctly recorded. But if the members of the Mission have no objection, my delegation would like to put this particular formulation more succinctly. We do so because it seems to us that, with this existing formulation, there is a possibility for misinterpretation by those who are so inclined to misinterpret it.

I should therefore like to suggest for the consideration of the Drafting Committee that the words "already" and "beginning to" be deleted; and that the word "assume" become "assuming". The sentence would now read:

"The Council notes with satisfaction the view of the Visiting Mission that some Micronesians are capable of assuming Cabinet-level responsibilities..." and so on.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Drafting Committee accept those suggestions?

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): I would accept that modification, and I believe my colleague also agrees to it. However, we should specify that this is not exactly the wording used by the Visiting Mission in its report.

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): I do not want to be pedantic, but as I am the only member present who is a member of the Visiting Mission, I can obviously not speak for them in suggesting a change in their recorded views. I suggest, therefore, that if we are to adopt these amendments -- on which I do not wish to express any particular view -- we should also omit the words "the view of the Visiting Mission". The sentence would then read as follows: "The Council notes with satisfaction that..."; and it would not be attributing this to the Visiting Mission. If that is accepted, I certainly will not object.

The PRESIDENT: There seems to be no objection to that formulation. So that the sentence under consideration would read: "The Council notes with satisfaction that some Micronesians are capable of assuming Cabinet-level responsibilities...", and so on.

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): I should not like to take exception to this new language; I should simply like the record to note that there is a difference between the views of the Visiting Mission and the language which has been suggested here.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): I should like a certain change to be made in paragraph 13 in the French text, which deals with the Peace Corps. It states, in French, that the Council is glad that Micronesians welcome...". I would add the word "favourably" -- "favorablement".

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): I have some trifling changes I would now propose in regard to paragraphs 7 and 10, if that be the wish of the President.

The PRESIDENT: You may proceed.

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): With regard to paragraph 7, line 9, which begins, "provide full-time services", I have just referred back to the precise wording of this resolution in the draft report, and I find it somewhat

ambiguous. I should like to suggest that we say instead: "to provide for the full-time services". The intention was that the request made to the Secretary of the Interior should ask him to amend his order in a way which would provide for members to give their full-time services; and I therefore feel it would be less open to ambiguity if we were to say: "to provide for the full-time services, and consequently, payment of members of the Congress of Micronesia."

I suggest the comma presently after "and" should follow the word "services" to make it more clear.

With respect to old paragraph 9, which is now paragraph 10, headed "Local government", in the seventh line I proposed in my introduction the insertion of the words "by the Congress of Micronesia" after the word "enactment"; and I simply want to confirm that I would like that amendment adopted.

Finally, in the last sentence of the same paragraph, the punctuation has got a little out of hand. Could we delete the commas after "at the same time" and "a useful local purpose", and insert a comma after "97,000 people"? I think that would make it clear.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will have noted these changes which the Chairman of the Drafting Committee has requested.

We shall now proceed to vote on paragraph 13, on the Peace Corps.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I am somewhat confused. Am I right in assuming that all other paragraphs have been adopted?

The PRESIDENT: The procedure that we decided upon was to take separate votes on certain paragraphs only if that was requested, after which we would adopt the entire section. We have not yet voted on the section. A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 13, on the Peace Corps, but no requests have been made for separate votes on any other paragraphs in this section.

Paragraph 13, as amended, was adopted by 6 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no other requests for separate votes on section II, we shall vote on the section as a whole, as amended.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): My delegation is concerned about the wording of the paragraph entitled "The Executive". The paragraph states that the Council notes "that there are still no Micronesians in the highest echelons of the executive". I do not think that this is sufficient. If we say later on that we know there are people capable of assuming responsibilities on the cabinet level, it is not sufficient merely to note this. My delegation would like to go on record as proposing that the Council should be "concerned" that there are still no Micronesians in the highest echelons. Therefore, we would delete the word "notes" and the sentence would read: "The Trusteeship Council is concerned that there are still no Micronesians...".

The PRESIDENT: Is the representative of Liberia making a definite proposal to be voted on by the Council?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): Yes, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Liberia has proposed the amendment of the first sentence of the section on the Executive -- which has become paragraph 9 -- so that the sentence would read: "The Trusteeship Council is concerned that there are still no Micronesians in the highest echelons of the executive..."

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): It may not be necessary for me to speak at the moment since I have made this point before. The United States, of course, would have no objection to the wording which has just been proposed by the representative of Liberia. We simply wish to note again, however, that there is definitely a discrepancy between the findings of the Visiting Mission on this point and the wording which has been suggested in the Council concerning the fact of capability.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Council now ready to vote on the proposal?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): It seems to me that a vote would not be necessary since the members of the Drafting Committee do not disapprove of my proposal, but rather accept it.

The PRESIDENT: I understand that the proposal is accepted by the members of the Drafting Committee.

The proposal, then, has been accepted that the first sentence should be amended to read: "The Trusteeship Council is concerned..." I might point out to the members of the Drafting Committee that in that case a word should be inserted in the next sentence, which would begin: "The Council is also concerned with the need..."

The Council will now vote on the entire section II, on Political Advancement.

Section II, as amended, was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to section III, on Economic Advancement. I believe that the representative of the Soviet Union has requested a separate vote on paragraph 14. Does any other representative wish a separate vote to be taken on any other paragraph?

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): I should like to ask for a separate vote on paragraphs 15 and 19. In the case of paragraph 15, I ask this on the ground that we have some doubts about the propriety of the first sentence as well as some doubts about the substance. Secondly, we do not agree with the substance of the finding in paragraph 19.

Paragraph 14 was adopted by 6 votes to 1.

Paragraph 15 was adopted by 4 vote to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 19 was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) (interpretation from French): I should like, Madam President, with your permission, to propose an improvement in the French text. I believe there is an error in translation in paragraph 15, "Public finance". In the second line before the end of that paragraph in the French text, the English word "everybody" has been translated into French as "all the Micronesians". This I think is erroneous, because it is followed by the words "including overseas residents", and since these latter would not be Micronesians, I think the English word "everybody" should be rendered by the French words for "all the inhabitants", which would include the overseas residents as well.

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): I would suggest, if I may at this stage, two brief corrections in paragraph 17 and another in paragraph 18.

In the second line of paragraph 17 there is a slight error of wording: the words "of the" should read "for" -- "as having the potential for early results".

In the seventh line of the same paragraph, paragraph 17, the word "tariff" should be in the plural -- "tariffs".

In the eighth line of paragraph 18, the word "develop" should be "developing" -- "to developing this sector".

The PRESIDENT: We are now ready to vote on section III as a whole, "Economic Advancement", as amended.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): May I invite the Council's attention to paragraph 18. As stated here by the Drafting Committee, "plans are underway to expand commercial fishery operations in the Territory". As far as my delegation is aware, the fishing industry that now exists in the Territory is owned by Van Camp. We could not care less whether Van Camp expands its fishing industry or whether it abolishes it tomorrow. We would be more concerned about whether the industry was owned by Micronesians and whether their operation was being expanded. My delegation therefore cannot go along with expressing pleasure at Van Camp's plans to expand the fishing industry. My proposal

(Mr. Eastman, Liberia)

and that of my delegation, therefore is that the paragraph be made to read as follows:

"Considering that fisheries have great economic potential, the Council trusts that the maximum opportunity will be provided for the training and participation of Micronesians at all levels."

The PRESIDENT: As I understand the proposal of the representative of Liberia, he would like to delete the words "is pleased to note that plans are underway to expand commercial fishery operations in the Territory" and change the wording as he has indicated. Is that a formal proposal?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): It is formal, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Council understand the proposal of the representative of Liberia?

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): I must say that, though the representative of Liberia does not care whether Van Camp expands or folds its tent and quietly steals away, the Micronesians, and the United States as Administering Authority, would for the moment like to see them stay; not only because this is the first large-scale commercial fishing venture in the Territory -- a venture which is in a position to bring in the needed outside capital and expertise -- but also because it, in the first place, provides an example for others who may wish to carry on such operations, and because in the second place provides a degree of training for Micronesians. My understanding is that an integral part of the Van Camp arrangement is that it provides the training which will enable Micronesians later to establish their own commercial fishing establishments. And in point of fact, if my memory serves me correctly, the reference which the Drafting Committee makes here is to a statement of the Special Representative to the effect that a number of co-operative business ventures in the fishing area are being considered and are about to be launched, indeed, by Micronesians, by that same group of the population which the

(Mr. McHenry, United States)

representative of Liberia and, indeed, the Administering Authority, are concerned to see, eventually and in as reasonably short a period of time as possible, becoming active in this particular area.

I simply wanted to say that by way of comment on the statement which the representative of Liberia has made.

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): I should like to say that I think the reason for the amendment proposed by our colleague from Liberia is that there is a misunderstanding or a difference of view on the facts. I was not aware, certainly, in assisting in the drafting of this paragraph, that the intention was that the development of the fisheries should be in the hands of Van Camp, and I cannot find any evidence for the view of the representative of Liberia to that effect. Both in our report to which I have just referred and in the statement by the Special Representative there are references to developments, including, as our colleague from the United States has mentioned, co-operative developments. If I may quote him briefly, the High Commissioner said:

"The Palau Fishermen's Cooperative, which produced approximately three-quarters of a million pounds of reef fish... has completed some packaging trials and is planning on setting up a small packaging operation. The fishing co-operative on Truk has purchased a small ice plant of its own and is now erecting a cold-storage plant. These facilities will make it possible to increase the production of reef fish in the Truk Lagoon."

(Mr. Posnett. United Kingdom)

Our intention was to welcome any development which improved the study and exploration of fishing possibilities in the Territory. In drafting this paragraph, we did not think that it was the general view of the Council that external capital should be excluded, but in our economic section we did say that, until the future status of the Territory was clear, plans for economic development must be pressed as far and as fast as possible, subject to the reservation that they must safeguard the potential of Micronesians in the expanding economy of their country, and must not prejudice their freedom of political choice. Any recommendation we made was certainly subject, and intended to be subject, to this general statement and of course to the statement which is mentioned in this particular paragraph that Micronesians must actually receive training not only in fishing, but at all levels -- that is, in the operation of machinery and technical matters and management -- and must also take part in the equity of the venture. Inevitably the amount of finance available in Micronesia by Micronesians to finance the purchase of ships and the operation of shipping companies is bound to be limited to start with, but provision can be made whereby joint companies can be set up with a development corporation such as we have suggested with provision for increased Micronesian participation as further Micronesian capital becomes available.

In the light of these facts, my delegation feels that the paragraph as drafted is a reasonably correct reflection both of the facts and of the general view of the Committee. Of course, we are subject to the views as expressed in this chamber.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I am sure there is a misunderstanding here. It is far from the intention of my delegation to exclude external capital from the Territory. I do not think we even mentioned this phrase when we made our proposal. I do not know how it crept in in the first place.

The point I am trying to make here is that, as everybody is aware, commercial fishing in the Territory is controlled and owned by Van Camp. The Special Representative, in reply to a question asked about fishing for the indigenous people, told this Council that the people of Micronesia were not inclined toward

(Mr. Eastman, Liberia)

fishing. However, we told him that since this is a great avenue for income they should be encouraged and the industry should be established in the Territory.

As the paragraph presently stands, there does not appear to me to be any initiative given to the people to establish the industry on their own, but the commercial fishing industry that is already established is being expanded and the indigenous people will have opportunity for training facilities and for participation.

For the sake of clarity, I do not exclude participation and training facilities, but I simply ask that the reference to our pleasure with the expanding commercial fishing operations which the drafters have included, should be eliminated. I do not think my original amendment destroys the sentence at all because it still provides opportunities after training by the industry now established in the Territory for the indigenous people or companies to establish their own. Having said that, I should like to reiterate my proposal:

"Considering that fisheries have great economic potential, the Council trusts that maximum opportunity will be provided for the training and participation of Micronesians at all levels."

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): The misunderstanding seems to centre around the definition of commercial fishing. The representative of Liberia himself stated that we all know that commercial fishing is controlled by Van Camp. I am not familiar enough with the statistics on fishing in the Trust Territory to give any final view as to percentages, but co-operative fishing is commercial fishing. Simply because the Van Camp Company, which happens to be in the Trust Territory and which was in fact encouraged by this Council, is in the Territory does not mean that there is no other fishing going on. Indeed, the Special Representative did cite specific examples of co-operative fishing ventures. It is the hope of the Administering Authority that further such ventures will be undertaken.

I do not believe that this Council wishes to put itself in the position of having the record show that a deletion was made in this regard and having this deletion interpreted to mean that such co-operative fishing ventures were not

being encouraged or looked upon as satisfactory. With regard to one point which the Special Representative did make and to which the representative of Liberia referred, I think it is generally true that the kind of fishing which is being carried on by the Van Camp Company and by some other companies there is the kind of fishing which so far the Micronesians have been reluctant to undertake. It is the kind which involves long or extended trips at sea, far out into the ocean area. My understanding is that the Micronesian fishermen have thus far been reluctant to undertake this kind of commercial fishing.

It is the hope of the Administering Authority that this kind of fishing which has great economic returns can be developed among the Micronesians themselves. Thus when one is talking about the particular commercial venture under discussion, it is not simply a question of expanding the Van Camp operation. I do not believe that the Visiting Mission intended to imply this. In fact I know of no plans of this particular company to expand its operations. My understanding here is that the Drafting Committee -- and I would ask the members to correct me if I am wrong-- is referring to developing the industry as a whole and not talking about any particular company. So that I would say, first, that "commercial" does not refer to any specific company, but is more comprehensive than the interpretation given to that term by the representative of Liberia; and secondly, that "expansion" probably means "development", and perhaps "develop" would take care of the representative of Liberia's concern. In this regard, though, I repeat that the United States is aware of no such plans in this area.

The PRESIDENT: We have a proposal before the Council to vote on an amendment suggested by the representative of Liberia to delete a portion of the first sentence of paragraph 18.

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): Perhaps I am out of order, but I should like to ask the representative of Liberia if the words "further develop" would take care of his particular objection, or if his concern is so great about "commercial" meaning only one company that this change would not do so.

The PRESIDENT: Would the suggested change which has been put forward, simply to change the phrase to read "are under way to further develop commercial fishery operations," in which the phrase "further develop" is substituted for the word "expand", meet the needs of the representative of Liberia?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): The words "further develop" would not entirely satisfy us, because it is my understanding that the commercial fishery conducted by the Micronesian people is strictly for local consumption, and that fishing as an industry for export purposes, for precise income, is not in the hands of the Micronesians. Therefore, that change would not satisfy my delegation.

The PRESIDENT: We will proceed to vote on the amendment suggested by the representative of Liberia.

The Liberian amendment to the first sentence of paragraph 18 was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We are now ready to vote on Section III, "Economic Advancement".

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): My delegation is prepared to vote, with the understanding that my statement concerning paragraph 18 will be recorded in its proper place.

The PRESIDENT: It will be recorded.

Section III was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider paragraph 20 of section IV, "Social Advancement".

Mrs. MEAGHER (World Health Organization): In the last line of paragraph 20, I should like to suggest that the word "team" be eliminated, since the recommendation in question was made by the WHO and not only by the team in question.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure there is no objection to this change in drafting. Are there any other comments?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): The second sentence states that the Visiting Mission held "that the general level of health of the population is already high...". The words "is already high" mean that no improvement is required and we do know that is far from the truth. If we must use the exact words of the Visiting Mission, then we should refer to document T/1658 in which it says that the level of health "is relatively high". I therefore propose that the word "relatively" replace the word "already".

The PRESIDENT: Is this substitution acceptable to the Drafting Committee?

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): I wonder if I might ask the representative of Liberia to draw my attention to this quotation from the Visiting Mission. I am sure he is right. I think I have it in paragraph 55. I would like to take this opportunity to express my apologies to the Council for this misquotation, which was an oversight and which I agree must be corrected.

The PRESIDENT: The change will be made to read "relatively high" instead of "already high".

Section IV was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We will now consider section V, "Educational Advancement". Is there any representative who wishes to have a separate vote on any paragraph in section V?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I do not make a request now for a separate vote. I would just like to ask the Drafting Committee to justify eliminating any mention of opportunities that had been offered to Micronesians to study abroad. In view of the statements that were made by certain delegations in which the United States was requested to furnish opportunities for study under scholarships offered by Members of the United Nations, why was no reference made to this offer of scholarships under "Educational Advancement"?

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): I confess that it was not my impression that there was a general conclusion that offers of scholarships had been turned down, but if this is the case, I would certainly have no objection to the inclusion of any wording which the representative of Liberia would like to insert.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I will speak slowly hereafter. For some reason, my dear friend, Mr. Posnett, does not understand me. I did not say "had been turned down". I want to know why no reference was made to the bid concerning scholarships, not whether the United States accepted or rejected them, which is not at all important, but for educational advancement there was a document circulated in which Members of the United Nations did offer scholarships in different categories. The United States representative, I do understand, made her statement and explained why her Government did not accept all of them or some of them, and my delegation also made a statement as to why not all of them were accepted. So I just thought that there would be a place under "Educational Advancement" to put this subject, not whether offers of scholarships were turned down or not, but just to reflect how the debate was carried on and the general view of the Council.

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): I have two points. One is an effort to correct the factual statement of the representative of Liberia. I do not think that the United States representative gave any reasons why the United States did not accept or reject any scholarships. I think that the representative of the United States did venture to give some reasons why Micronesians might find some scholarships good and others bad. The United States itself takes no position on these fellowships. All information is made available to Micronesians, as I am sure the representative of the Soviet Union can now confirm.

Secondly, with regard to this particular topic, it is my understanding that it is the general view of the Council that the views of the members should be reflected in the report under this item. It is my recollection that in the past this has been done under the discussion of this particular item.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to point out to the representative of Liberia that this was considered as a special item and that the views of the members, including the views of the representative of Liberia, have been recorded under a separate item.

Mr. LIN (China): I should like to have a separate vote on paragraph 22. The second sentence of that paragraph states:

"The Council endorses the view of the Mission that urgent attention should be given to vocational and technical education..."

With all respect for the Visiting Mission, we are not in a position to endorse or reject because we do not know whether the Micronesians need more technical and vocational education and if they should have more opportunities to study art, literature, philosophy and music. After all, the cultivation of the mind is as important as the building of roads.

Secondly, the Special Representative has told us that the Administering Authority has entered into a contract with the Stanford University Research Institute to carry out a study. We doubt the wisdom of this move. Furthermore, we cannot endorse the Visiting Mission's recommendation that UNESCO should be requested to make another study. We often forget that it is the Micronesians

who must make the studies and who know what they want. We do not know what they want. We always think that we can find something for them, and this is a matter of education.

I will abstain from this vote. I cannot give any definite views on these recommendations, nor can I reject them. I am not wise enough either to endorse or to reject them.

The PRESIDENT: Am I to understand that the representative of China is requesting a separate vote on paragraph 22 as a whole?

Mr. LIN (China): Yes, as a whole.

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): Perhaps I might mention, in view of what has been said by the representative of China, that there is certainly no intention to reduce the study of the arts or music, or cultivation of the mind. I think that the phrase "better adapted to the Micronesian environment" perhaps explains this. What the Visiting Mission found in Micronesia was large numbers of youngsters leaving school who were ill-adapted to the circumstances in which they had to live, who were unable to earn a living because they were not trained to do so. I think that those Micronesians who have special artistic or musical talents should certainly have those talents developed. We saw a great deal of evidence of this in indigenous music and carvings, and in fact we have made some mention of this in our report. But we were anxious to get away from a situation in which people came from schools ready to do white collar jobs which did not exist. With the best will in the world, the people of Micronesia are not going to earn a living because of their singing ability. Some of them may be able to earn a living by being able to make beautiful carvings, but this is a limited pursuit.

The PRESIDENT: We will now have a separate vote on paragraph 22.

Paragraph 22 was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Section V was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider section VI, "Establishment of Intermediate Target Dates and Final Time-Tables for the Attainment of Self-Government or Independence".

I understand that separate votes have been requested on paragraphs 24 and 25. There will also be a separate vote automatically on paragraph 26.

Does the representative of Liberia wish to make a comment regarding paragraph 24?

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): I would put this question: who thinks it would be premature to make definite recommendations at this time? It is my understanding that it is the Administering Authority, and I should like some assurance that this is what the Drafting Committee had in mind.

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): The representative of Liberia is correct. That was a quotation from a statement made by the Administering Authority.

The PRESIDENT: As there is no further comment on paragraph 24, we shall now vote on it.

Paragraph 24 was adopted by 5 votes to 1. with 1 abstention.

Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia): My delegation abstained from voting on paragraph 24. We know that this is a Trust Territory and that the United States has an obligation to develop it and to help to speed it along to independence as quickly as possible. We also know that the wishes of the people must be respected concerning self-determination or independence. We did not vote for that paragraph because we did not think it is the duty of the Administering Authority to recommend whether a people has or has not sufficiently matured for independence. Rather than go into the details of the question and begin a new debate, my delegation preferred to abstain and it will express its views later, at the appropriate time.

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): The statement in question originated in a statement made by the Administering Authority to the Visiting Mission. I do not believe it is a statement of doctrine as much as it is a statement of fact. If we were able to say that tomorrow Micronesia could exercise its right of self-determination, I am sure that there would be large number of people, not to mention some who are concerned with keeping budgets, up or down, who might welcome that opportunity, along with a good many Micronesians. I do not think there is anything sinister involved or that the United States is trying to put forth any doctrine as much as it is trying to recognize the actual state of the situation at this particular time. I think that the statement read as a whole rather than in parts -- indeed, the representative of Liberia indicated that it was necessary to read the entire statement -- would indicate that there is no particular doctrine here, but simply a statement of fact and a recognition of the importance of the views of the Micronesian people in the exercise of its own right of self-determination.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on paragraph 25.

Paragraph 25 was adopted by 6 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: With respect to paragraph 26, the representative of the Soviet Union has asked for a separate vote on the phrase in the third from the last line beginning with "and 1541 (XV) of 15 December 1960...".

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): Before the vote is taken I wish merely to explain on behalf of the Drafting Committee that this draft was taken almost in its entirety from the agreed conclusions adopted by the Council last year, to which the representative of the Soviet Union at the time subscribed, including the phrase which he now seeks to delete.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): It is very difficult for me now to say exactly what was said at the last session of the Trusteeship Council about resolution 1541 (XV). I should simply like to clarify what we are voting for now. Are we voting to maintain or to delete the phrase?

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the deletion of the phrase as proposed by the Soviet Union.

The Soviet proposal was rejected by 5 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 26 was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Section VI as a whole was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: With respect to the working paper on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, document T/L.1121 and Add.1, I should like to draw the attention of the Council to some corrections relating to language as well as substance. The Secretary will read them out, and if members have no objection to the corrections, the working paper will be revised accordingly and the report to the Security Council will contain those corrections:

Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council): I should like to bring to the attention of the members of the Council certain points relating to certain corrections that have been brought to the attention of the Secretariat by the members of the Drafting Committee relating to the Outline of Conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. These corrections are basically linguistic corrections and relate to form. In certain instances, however, they also relate to questions of substance, and I should like to read them out one by one so that the members of the Council will be well aware of these corrections. Then, as the President has stated, if there are no objections to them they will be incorporated in this section of the report to the Security Council.

The first relates to paragraph 1 of document T/L.1121. The word "throughout" in the second line should read "across". This is purely a linguistic correction. With regard to paragraph 3, in the fifth line the words "are having", should be replaced by the word "have". The sentence would then read "the great distances that separate the components of Micronesia have an important bearing...".

The last sentence in paragraph 5 should be omitted. It appears to be unnecessary. The words "practically all" in paragraph 9 should be changed to "most of", so that the sentence would then read "At most of the meetings..." instead of "At practically all the meetings".

The title of paragraph 10 should be amended to read "Land questions" instead of "Land claims". In line 5 of paragraph 11, the word "land" should read "land tenure". In line 6, the word "utilization" should be replaced by the words "better utilization". In line 11, at the end of the paragraph, it should read "(b) the appointment of a specialist land officer called a Director of Land Management", instead of a "Realty Officer".

In paragraph 25, the words "a total of 316 measures were introduced" should be deleted. This is somewhat contradictory with the statement that appears in the report of the Administering Authority.

In the last line of paragraph 26, the words "made an" should read "yet made much". Thus the last line of the paragraph would read "the Standing Committee so far did not appear to have yet made much effective contribution" instead of "made an effective contribution".

In the sixth line of paragraph 27, the word "providing" should read "provided". In line 16, the words "elected at least" should read "elected for at least". In line 25, the words "hold office in" should read "serve as member of".

With regard to paragraph 32, the word "fiscal" in line 13, should be deleted and after "\$750,000" the words should be added "apart from \$350,000 available to local governments". This is taken from paragraph 263 of the Visiting Mission's report.

A suggestion has been made also that before paragraph 34 we should insert a new section entitled "The Executive", and that under that heading we should place paragraphs 41, 43 and 44. Those paragraphs would then become paragraphs 34, 35 and 36. This would necessitate some changes in the enumeration of the paragraphs.

With regard to paragraph 34, the title should read "Local government" instead of "District legislatures and local government".

With regard to paragraph 42, there should be a heading "Peace Corps" and this paragraph, it is suggested, should follow paragraph 48.

With regard to paragraph 52, the word "which" in line 3 should be deleted and in line 9 the word "suggests" should read "suggested".

With regard to paragraph 54, it is proposed to delete the seventh sentence which begins, "In the meantime, a proposed budget increase was being readied..."

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom): I wish merely to point out that an amendment to this paragraph has already been circulated. It is the seventh sentence of the corrected paragraph, and it does in fact begin with the words "In the meantime", but it is not shown in T/L.1121; it appears in the first addendum to that document.

Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council): With regard to paragraph 55, it is suggested that the word "of" should be deleted in the penultimate line, so that it would read "During the year under review there were twenty-six thrift and lending institutions". It is an error.

(Mr. Rifai, Secretary of
the Council)

With regard to paragraph 57, the first sentence should be deleted, which reads: "Agricultural efficiency in the Trust Territory compares favourably ...".

Likewise, the first sentence of paragraph 62 should be deleted -- namely: "A manufacturing industry, though small, is developing slowly..." -- as it does not seem to be describing the Visiting Mission's report.

In so far as paragraph 69 is concerned, there is a suggestion that the following be substituted for the fifth to eighth sentences:

"In 1962, the Administering Authority decided to provide for Micronesian candidates full medical training leading to an M.D. degree. But since no fully-qualified doctors or dentists will be graduating for a number of years, the use of expatriate medical and dental staff in the Trust Territory will continue to be necessary. Meanwhile, after an interval of five years, the Administering Authority has decided to resume use of the Fiji School of Medicine".

With respect to paragraph 74, on the third line of page 35 of document T/L.1121, the word "look" should be changed to "looking".

Then, in paragraph 78, we should delete the eighth sentence, and the first word of the ninth sentence, which read as follows: "Despite these programmes and activities Similarly...".

With regard, next, to paragraph 79, after the words "Peace Corps", the rest of the sentence should be deleted -- namely, the words "which plans to send a large number of the volunteers to be stationed in outlying island communities."

Turning now to the fourth line of paragraph 86, we should delete the words "and the lowering of the compulsory age to 6 years on a Territory-wide basis had been under consideration."

Those are the suggested corrections to this document. If the members of the Council are agreeable to them, they will be included in this part of the final report to the Security Council.

The PRESIDENT: With those corrections which the Secretary has just recommended, we shall now proceed to vote on paragraph 4 of document T/L.1125. The Drafting Committee has recommended that the Council adopt the revised working paper on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/L.1121/Add.1) as a basic text for the chapter on conditions in that Territory, to be included in the next report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council.

The working paper, as amended, was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: Also, in paragraph 5, the Committee has recommended that the conclusions and recommendations which the Council has just adopted be included at the end of each appropriate section or sub-section of the chapter.

Before putting this recommendation to the vote, I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to know whether we are voting on only one section -- namely, the section prepared by the Secretariat. I see there are also the recommendations of the Council, but there has been no vote on that section. It seems to me we must first vote on that section, and then decide where to include it.

The PRESIDENT: As I understand it, the Council has already voted on the conclusions and recommendations set out in the annex below.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I apologize. I did not understand that the Council had already voted. The Council has voted on each individual section of the recommendations and conclusions contained in document T/L.1125, but we have not voted on the document as a whole.

The PRESIDENT: We have not voted on the document as a whole; we are just about to do so. Is that now clear to the representative of the Soviet Union?

We are now voting on the recommendation of the Committee, contained in paragraph 5, that the conclusions and recommendations which the Council has adopted be included at the end of each appropriate section or sub-section of the chapter.

(The President)

We are now voting on the recommendation in paragraph 5 that the conclusions and recommendations which the Council has adopted should be included at the end of each appropriate section or sub-section of the chapter. After voting on this recommendation we shall vote on the report of the Drafting Committee as a whole.

The Secretary has suggested that we should vote first on the annex as a whole.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that that would be the most logical procedure; therefore, I suggested that we should vote first on the conclusions and recommendations, and thereafter on the document as a whole.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): It seems to me that the suggestion which I made, namely, that we vote first on paragraph 5 and then on the document as a whole is the logical one and is, in fact, what the representative of the Soviet Union wishes. I do not see that there is any distinction between voting on paragraph 5 and voting on the annex as a whole because this paragraph provides for the adoption of these conclusions and recommendations. The only further addition which it makes is that they should be added at the end of each appropriate section or sub-section of the chapter. I suggest that we should vote on this paragraph 5, which perhaps covers the position of the representative of the Soviet Union, and then vote on the document as a whole.

The PRESIDENT: I think that the suggestion by the representative of New Zealand is according to the customary procedure of the Council. Therefore, we shall proceed to vote on paragraph 5.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 5 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): As I read the report of the Drafting Committee, and specifically its paragraph 5, I believe that we have completed the adoption of the report by the vote which has just been taken and which adopts as a whole the conclusions and recommendations which had been adopted earlier on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and also by indicating that these conclusions and recommendations should be placed in the appropriate section or chapter of the Working Paper adopted earlier.

If my assumption is correct, I should like to make one general statement about the voting of the United States delegation on this question.

The PRESIDENT: I believe that we have now voted on the report and on the conclusions and recommendations as a whole -- unless the representative of the Soviet Union wishes that vote to be repeated.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have no objection to the procedure which the President suggests inasmuch as we have approved the section prepared by the Secretariat and, secondly, the conclusions and recommendations. Therefore, the positions of all delegations have been expressed on each section. Thus, that procedure could be followed. But in principle it seems to me that it would have been preferable to vote on the report as a whole. Nevertheless I do not press for this. This is simply a procedural comment, and I agree with the President that this would indeed be a repetition of what we have already voted upon.

Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): I just wished to state that in keeping with the general practice followed by the United States, the United States delegation has abstained from voting on the relevant sections of the report on the Pacific Islands. My delegation will undertake a careful study of the conclusions and recommendations of the Council as well as of the conclusions and recommendations of the Visiting Mission on the conduct of the administration of the Territory.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.