



Twenty-seventh Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
 on Thursday, 15 June 1961, at 2.30 p.m.

President: Mr. BINGHAM (United States)
 (Vice-President)

1. Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories: New Guinea [4d] (continued)
2. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)
 - (a) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ending 30 June 1960 [4f]
 - (b) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands [6]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1149 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 4d

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITIES ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST TERRITORIES: NEW GUINEA (T/1561, 1567, 1569; T/L.1010; T/PET.8/16, 17; T/PET.8/L.6) (continued)

General debate (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Dudley McCarthy, Special Representative for the Trust Territory of New Guinea under Australian administration, took a place at the Trusteeship Council table.

Mr. McCARTHY (Special Representative): I do not propose, at this stage of the Council's consideration of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea, to make a long statement: partly because there is comparatively little which can with profit now be added by me to what we have already said or circulated; partly -- and perhaps most importantly -- because the stimulating questions, discussions, expressions of opinion, and debates, which have taken place round this table, have amply shown the degree to which nearly all delegations have pondered the problems of New Guinea.

There are, however, a few additional items of information to which I wish to refer briefly and, as a preliminary to this reference, and to the few observations which I am prompted by the debate itself to offer, I would like to say how much I personally, and my colleague Mr. Jubilee, have appreciated the way in which we have been received by the President, by you yourself, Mr. Vice-President, and by the other members of this Council and the very kindly references to us which have been made by most of the representatives. This has been a particular kindness because neither of us would suggest that we have approached this, our first occasion here, without a sense of ordeal ahead -- for this is part of the greatest forum which mankind has yet evolved; and we have been conscious of appearing before it so that in us, and through us, our countries are offered in very important respects to the judgement of the rest of the world. But this sense of ordeal has quickly passed for both of us, both in our own persons and in our representative capacities, for we have met in the President, and in you, sir, most helpful and distinguished presiding officers and a group of representatives of other great countries, of whom most have made it clear that

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

they wish to assist Australia in her task in New Guinea and are applying deep thought and much energy to doing so. I would be most grateful if you would personally convey this expression to the President himself when he returns.

For this we thank you most sincerely.

One of the representatives here present expressed interest in knowing something more of the impressions which I personally carried away from my first observations of this Council and its workings last year. I do not propose, however, to attempt to traverse these; nor, even if I wished to do so, would it be possible, because impressions are absorbed by so many different means and from so many different sources that they often become feelings which do not lend themselves to logical definitions or analysis. This, however, I can say -- that one of my most vivid impressions was of a group of representatives earnestly and with dignity addressing themselves to most important purposes. And this is an impression which has been received also both by the Australian Government and the Administration through which it works in the Trust Territory. I mention this now particularly as a preliminary to assuring you that the record of questions and debates in this Council, and the resolutions which this Council sees fit to carry in due course will be most carefully studied, both by the Australian Government and by the Administration of the Territory. This is not to say, of course, that either will agree at all points with this Council, or bend themselves with equal effort in those directions which members of this Council have suggested for their consideration; but it does mean that whether they agree or disagree at this point or that, in whole or part, with what has been said, they will do so only following the closest and most detailed consideration.

In this connexion I would observe, as we have indeed already observed in previous years, that Australia, as the Administering Authority, looks to this Council for the same understanding of its own special position in relation to New Guinea, and of its own knowledge of that Territory and its purposes there, as for its own part it gives to this Trusteeship Council, in relation to the ~~Trusteeship~~ Council's own purposes and combined knowledge and experience.

I think it very relevant to quote here the Australian permanent representative to the United Nations, Mr. Plimsoll, when he was addressing himself to this problem before the General Assembly on 2 December of last year. He said then:

"After the Charter came into effect, Australia proceeded to place under the international Trusteeship System the mandates which it had held under the League of Nations.

"Furthermore, although the Charter does not lay down as an obligation the submission of political information on non-self-governing territories, the Australian Government has, from the very beginning, voluntarily submitted this information to the United Nations. We have, throughout, co-operated with the United Nations, we have explained our policies in the Trusteeship Council and in the Fourth Committee, and we have endeavoured in the last fifteen years to discharge our obligations under the Charter faithfully. So we do not come before this Organization now, or at any time, in a reluctant way. We come on each occasion to give an account of what we have voluntarily undertaken and, indeed, gladly undertaken." (A/PV.933, p. 31)

To this I would like to add an observation of my own from long experience in, and with the administration of, New Guinea. I personally believe that there could be no Administering Authority in this world which has addressed itself more faithfully or more loyally to the terms of the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreement to which it is a party, than Australia. This has not been a matter only of faithfully observing a contract; it has been a matter of observing and adhering to principles which Australia for its own personal part holds most dear. Representatives will recall, I have little doubt, that, at the very birth of this great organization of the United Nations, Australia played such an important part that her hand almost literally wrote fundamental chapters of the Charter, and that Australia was in the very forefront of those Powers "that were pressing for a clear recognition and acceptance of wider national responsibility and accountability than had existed before the war".

And this leads me now to references to much that has been said in this Council recently regarding independence for New Guinea. Australia has pledged itself to bring the people of New Guinea to the point of self-determination. Self-determination and independence are not the same thing because self-determination is a process: it is the exercise of the right of the people to determine-- that is to choose-- their own future. They will choose their own form of government, and they will determine the nature of their state. The Prime Minister of Australia said to the United Nations General Assembly on 5 October last:

"...we regard ourselves as having a duty to produce as soon as it is practicable an opportunity for complete self-determination for the people of Papua and New Guinea." (Official Records, United Nations General Assembly, 830th Plenary Meeting, paragraph 46)

The Australian Minister for Territories, The Hon. Paul Hasluck, has said:

"The end of trusteeship comes with self-government and independence. One point which should be recognized internationally is that political independence on its own is of limited value unless the people have the capacity to use their independence to their own advantage."

It was against such a background that the Australian Permanent Representative to the United Nations said, also before the General Assembly last December:

"...our approach to the problems of colonialism can, I think, be fruitful only when we recognize that there are different sorts of colonies, just as there are different sorts of administering Powers, different sorts of problems to be overcome and different sorts of ways of meeting them ... We have heard in this debate ... about the crimes of the colonialists. And when I heard them I thought that they might be true in some times of history and in some places in this world, but they are certainly not true of any territory that has been administered by Australia. And it is for Australia that I am speaking. I am not speaking for any other Administering Power ... Profit has not been our motive. As far as Australia is concerned, the task of administering New Guinea and of advancing the indigenous inhabitants has been a heavy economic and financial burden, and it is a burden that will continue. Therefore, the classical ideas of the economic exploitation of colonies do not apply in the case of New Guinea. The people of New Guinea

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

are our neighbours ... We want to be friends with them. We want them to be partners with us in a common endeavour and in the interests of our common peace. We look forward to bringing them to nationhood. We have accepted and have gone beyond our obligations under the Charter to bring them to nationhood ... None of us would say that there is no good or no bad in this institution of colonialism. But we are all agreed that we should bring it, as rapidly as possible, to an end in the form of self-government for all the peoples of the world." (A/PV.933, pps. 32, 36, 46)

Each of the statements which I have quoted are direct and unequivocal. But to what each of these Australians has said I would presume to add now myself this reminder in terms which I have generally already used in this Council.

When we talk of self-government in New Guinea -- or self-determination or independence -- we must recall that the first and most difficult task of the Australian Government's, in association with and through the response of the people of New Guinea themselves, has been to create a single self to govern itself. Without this creation there can be no meaning to any of the terms most commonly used. And to this task Australia has addressed itself with great vigour.

I would like to repeat this also: that when the accidents of history led Australia into New Guinea there was never any upset by it of any existing form of government in any recognizable form as such, common to the whole island and the adjacent islands or indeed common to any significant part of that island or islands; whatever forms of tribal sway obtained, they did so in each one of a thousand or more different areas, and spread themselves over a thousand or more groups which were strange or hostile to one another. We must be in no error about this: there was no government; there was no one people. We, and the many tribal and language indigenous groups in the country are together making a national people and are making the government; and we, the present Administering Authority, shall in due course hand to the nation we and the people themselves have made, the government which they wish -- and in doing so will place before the world a new nation free, independent and able to take its place honourably and effectively in the twentieth century world, and add to the peace and harmony of that world -- not shatter it nor detract from that peace and harmony.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

Against this background, I would like now to speak briefly to some of the remarks made by various representatives earlier this week.

First we listened with great interest to the statement of the representative for New Zealand. We have noted particularly his remarks regarding the development of the public service; the development of women's interests; and the emphasis which he has placed on "hope, development and education". I can assure the representative that every effort will be made to maintain the really great impetus which has been developed within the public service, both in its expatriate recruitment programmes and with regard to its programme of indigenous recruitment and training. I can assure him also that the Administration is actively promoting women's interests; the great increase in the number of women's clubs alone is evidence of this; with the outstanding work which has been done in the Territory by the Women's Interests Officer of the South Pacific Commission and the follow up of that work which is developing; with the increasing part which women are playing throughout the territory in political development. I can assure him also that we understand his concern with the necessity for emphasis on hope, development and education. For the first, I can truly say that there is now greater hope for a fuller life than any of the indigenous people have known for the past 2,000 years; development is pushing rapidly ahead in all spheres of administrative effort; with regard to education I would take this opportunity of inviting this Council's attention collectively to the fact that, though the Administering Authority is far from complacent about its own achievements, it has achieved a great deal in education. Perhaps the biggest change has been in raising the standard of education. We have many more good schools today than we did a few years ago. Higher primary schools, technical schools and secondary schools have been established. At the same time, outside the Education Department considerable progress has been made in training the native people in medicine, agriculture, local government and co-operatives. In the public service special training establishments of a high order have been provided for public service training purposes. We have many thousands of children in really effective schools. We have developed great impetus in educational building programmes. We have developed extraordinary efforts to overcome the problem of teacher shortages. In this field, as in the other administrative fields, we will achieve our purposes at an ever accelerating rate, conscious of the fact that education, perhaps more than anything else, is the key to the future.

(Mr. McCarthy,
Special Representative)

It has been most encouraging to have the expressions of confidence and support which the representative of the United States has accorded us. We have noted particularly his emphasis on the necessity for the development of economic enterprises by and through the indigenous people. Evidence of our agreement with this is to be found already in the positive facts that a great percentage of annual production is already coming from the hands of the indigenous people, and this very substantial percentage will increase rapidly on the basis of action which has already been taken. We have noted particularly also his reference to the need for caution with respect to land policies and would like to inform him that this matter, and the associated legal implications, were made the subject of particular investigation by Professor Derham in his recent examination of the legal system of the Territory.

The remarks made by the Soviet representative as third speaker in the debate were noted carefully by us. With regard to his observations in relation to the Assembly resolution, I would refer him to earlier remarks which I have made in this statement and elsewhere during this present Council session. With regard to his suggestions for an immediate referendum I would refer him particularly to information which I have provided regarding the recent elections and the observations made by the representative of the United States that these, even to make possible the development of a limited vote, called for "truly extraordinary ingenuity" on the part of the Administration. I would assure him also that the whole body of the indigenous opinion which has addressed itself to this matter of political advancement has approved the recent political reforms of which this Council has been made aware. And that, one after another, candidates for membership of the Legislative Council throughout the Territory have expressed their confidence in the Australian Administration and have accepted its assurances for the future. I would like also to correct certain obvious misapprehensions which he has developed. Initially, in doing so, I would refer back to part of the statement made before the General Assembly by Mr. Plimsoll which I have already quoted -- that part which reads:

"Profit has not been our motive. As far as Australia is concerned, the task of administering New Guinea and of advancing the indigenous inhabitants has been a heavy economic and financial burden and it is a burden that will continue. Therefore, the classical ideas of the economic exploitation of colonies do not apply in the case of New Guinea."

(Mr. McCarthy,
Special Representative)

Professing a different viewpoint the Soviet representative has quoted as a fact that recently a company concerned with the production of coffee has paid annual dividends of some 40 per cent. This is not so; and indeed, like the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, such a reward is forever incapable of attainment in the circumstances of New Guinea. The company to which I think he may be referring has already found such to its cost, and reference to this year's records of the Supreme Court of New South Wales will reveal the existence of a petition to wind up a company which had been promoted under the name of New Guinea Coffee Estates Limited, without any profits having been made and therefore without any dividends having been paid.

I should like also to correct the misapprehension of the Soviet representative that the native people -- or anybody else -- has any legal obligation to pay taxes to any Church. This is not so. I should like also to correct the misapprehension that the relevant remarks by the Administration's Director of Health on the occasion of the opening of the Madang Hospital referred to an infant death rate in some parts of New Guinea as being seven out of ten; the reference was to a survival rate of seven out of ten -- exactly the reverse, as I have already informed this Council during the general questioning period in reply to questions by Mr. Rasgotra.

In addition, I have previously quoted figures to show the great advances made by the Administration in relation to this problem; have presented to this Council visual examples in the way of films of the devoted work which is being carried out by Australians in this field, and have stated that in this as in the other fields of health activity, the Administration stands proudly on its record.

If I may, I should like to add that it is a matter of genuine regret to us that in thus attempting to direct attention to alleged deficiencies of the Administration in the health field, the Soviet representative did not feel free to suggest that the remarks which wrongly reported were in fact made on an occasion when a million pound hospital for the benefit of the people of New Guinea was being opened at Madang as part of a programme -- already well advanced -- involving many millions, of which the greater part has come from taxation levied upon the Australian people themselves, and whatever other sources of revenue have been developed in Australia itself by the efforts of hard-working people there. Mr. Oberemko has also referred to reports of recent sentences of death in a certain

(Mr. McCarthy,
Special Representative)

area, which incidentally is part of Papua. This reference is clearly tactical only, for he should know as well as I do myself -- and I believe he does -- that there is merely a legal form involved here; that, in the whole post-war period in the Territory, only two such sentences have been carried out. In this particular case, I am now able to report that, in accordance with the standard procedure the sentences have been reviewed and have now been commuted to terms of imprisonment of some three years in each case.

To round off this matter, I should like to refer back to words which I used in my opening statement regarding the observations of the trial judge in a similar case of a particularly savage kind. Those observations might be used equally well in relation to this present case, if the reference to my own personal visits were deleted. I said:

"The sentence was indeed commuted to some three years' imprisonment and I myself, only a few weeks ago, visited and talked with these prisoners in the corrective institution ... There they are thriving; they are clean and healthy with a cleanliness and general health they have never known before; they have been taught simple tasks which are basic to life as we know it but hitherto were completely strange to them; they are being taught quite advanced arts and crafts of various kinds. ... These people will in much lesser time than the term of their commuted sentences return to their people as emissaries in some measure (and it is confidently hoped in substantial measure) of important aspects of civilization as we know it." (T/PV.1137, pp. 52-53)

While referring to the remarks of the Soviet representative I would also like to express my regret that he has placed himself in constant opposition to the view that the informed and developed voice of the people of the Territory should alone state the form in which they will ultimately express their own independence.

After the Soviet representative had concluded his remarks I listened with appreciation to the expression of satisfaction offered by the representative of Burma in relation to the recent political developments in the Territory. I listened with interest also to his expressions of concern that the indigenous people should be trained as rapidly as possible for the highest positions in the

(Mr. McCarthy,
Special Representative)

Public Service and can assure him that the Administration is bending great efforts to this end and will even increase these efforts in the period which lies immediately ahead.

U Aung Thant exhorted the Administering Authority to intensify its efforts in the field of education. The Administering Authority would be the last to disagree with the importance of this -- and indeed is doing so. In his considered statements, at times critical -- as it is the right, and indeed the duty, of members of this Council to be where they consider this necessary -- the representative of Burma properly concluded -- and again we have noted this with particular interest and appreciate its importance -- with an exhortation to the Administering Authority to recognize the fast-changing conditions of the times in which we live.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

The representative of China, from his own personal knowledge of New Guinea, has detected the pattern of orderly progress to which I have previously referred. I was particularly interested in his remarks regarding the problems of training and staffing a service engaged at the same time upon the two-fold task of opening new areas and building up the whole complex of development in the more advanced areas and in the wake of the penetration and exploration patrols. This is indeed a problem. And here I would observe that the existence of this problem in its many forms makes even more difficult the educative task of the Administration in relation to indigenous officers -- to which, it will be recalled, the Public Service Commissioner of the Territory referred in measured terms in that part of his annual report which I quoted in my opening statement. The representative of China may be sure that his remarks in this, and in the other contexts to which he referred, will be well noted.

It was with particular interest that I listened to the remarks of the leader of the United Kingdom delegation. In the field of the development of dependent areas the United Kingdom's voice carries particular weight. On this occasion it has encouraged us, while inviting our attention to matters of particular concern which we will consequently closely scrutinize.

To the representative of Paraguay we should express our thanks for his measured and helpful assessments. In relation to his first and very important point that perhaps progress in New Guinea might be considered slow from the point of view of time, I would offer the observation that the proper development and emergence of people is necessarily slow in comparison with the processes of manipulation which can be brought to bear on inanimate things. I offer this thought in no spirit of rejection, but with the same objectivity as his observation was itself made. We have noted too the references which were made to the general programme of development of uncontrolled areas and the necessity for achieving a necessary coincidence here with the fundamental development of the political advancement programme. The representative will no doubt have noted the fact that the target date for the completion of this phase of work should coincide very closely with the end of the first period in which the reconstituted Legislative Council will have been able to try itself out. We have noted also his reference

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

to the reconstitution of the Legislative Council as "a good beginning". We do agree most whole-heartedly that the relevant reforms are not an end but only a stage in the progress towards self-government.

The representative of Belgium has succinctly and vigorously assessed the situation. We have noted his remarks carefully and particularly his references to the importance of the development of local Government Councils; to the necessity for stressing unifying lines; to the importance of the development of a corps of indigenous officials. We thank the representative and have noted also his generous reference to the "generosity of the Australian Government".

The representative of France has invited the Council's attention, inter alia, to the important fact that "there is no single recipe for the evolution of under-developed countries". We share his regret that it has not yet been found possible, in a certain few areas, finally to complete the task of exploration and pacification, but we have noted and endorse the wisdom of his observation that it is "not so much a question of conquering, but of discovering, of understanding, of convincing, and of organizing". It has been encouraging to note France's observation of the value of the link between the Legislative and Executive which is represented by the Administrator's Council. Not only I myself, here for the Administering Authority, but the expatriate residents of the Territory have generally expressed themselves in favour of "universal suffrage and single lists". And it is very true that universal suffrage itself, once granted, causes an acceleration in political training and awareness. We thank the representative also for his grateful expressions of appreciation of the work of the Australian delegation.

In view of his firsthand experience, and subsequent very lively personal interest, in New Guinea, Mr. Rifai's remarks proved particularly interesting. His exposition of the relative importance of economic, social and political development expressed a point of view which could open a field of very productive debate. This is not the moment, however, for such an exercise. We are aware, of course, of the United Arab Republic's particular interest in the extension of full administration control over all areas of New Guinea. In part I was reporting direct to them in this context in my opening statement. We have noted now the continuing interest of this delegation in this matter. The

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

representative's remarks regarding the beneficial effects of the administrative union have been welcomed by us. In noting Mr. Rifai's awareness of the significance of the recent reforms in the Legislative Council, we have noted also his reservations under this heading, but do not agree that the reconstitution of the Council has made little contribution to the effective participation by the people in the conduct of their affairs. We feel sure indeed that it has made, on the contrary, as it was designed to do, a most significant contribution.

At this stage I would like to refer briefly to the observations which have been made, not only by Mr. Rifai, but by other representatives to the matter of representation by the Christian missions on the Legislative Council. I should make it clear that such representation is not mandatory under the amended Papua and New Guinea Act, the relevant sections of which read actually:

"(1) The Legislative Council shall consist of thirty-seven members, namely:

- (a) the Administrator;
- (b) fourteen officers of the Territory, to be known as official members, appointed by the Governor-General on the nomination of the Administrator;
- (c) twelve persons elected by electors of the Territory; and
- (d) ten persons, to be known as appointed members, appointed by the Governor-General on the nomination of the Administrator.

"(2) The Administrator shall so exercise his powers of nomination under paragraph (d) of the last preceding sub-section as to ensure that the appointed members include not less than five members resident in the Territory of New Guinea and not less than five native members."

The appointment of two representatives of the missions is, therefore, an administrative action designed to give at this present stage a voice to Territory residents who are very closely in touch with the native people and conscious of their feelings in a way which is perhaps denied to people in other categories. In noting with interest Mr. Rifai's observations that, in this age in which we live "the loudest voice is that of freedom" I am constrained to

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

observe -- and I do so in no spirit of carping contradiction -- that the Administering Authority has already brought much freedom to the people of the Territory; alone, the freedom from fear which now prevails is of inestimable value. Mr. Rifai may be assured that his remarks will receive the closest continuing attention of the Administering Authority.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

Mr. Salamanca has asked, very rightly, whether the difficulties of development in New Guinea are really insuperable. The answer to that is: No, given time. Evidence of this is the extent to which the Administering Authority has already overcome, and is continuing at an accelerated rate to overcome, these difficulties. Mr. Salamanca has also invited our attention to the desirability of selecting and training students at present in Australia for administrative posts. I should like to assure him that this has not been overlooked up to the present by the Administration and will not be overlooked in the future. It was a matter of regret to us that Mr. Salamanca's exacting and important duties in other United Nations spheres compelled him to make his remarks briefer than we might otherwise have hoped, although fortunately my delegation has had the advantage of private discussion with him on some of the problems. I thank him most sincerely for his kind personal references to me, and I thank him, also, on behalf of my colleague, Mr. Jubilee.

If I may say so, I consider that Mr. Rasgotra's address was a fitting climax to a most interesting debate. I should like to thank him particularly for his observation that, difficult and complex though the human experiment in New Guinea is, neither this nor the other difficulties of that Territory are beyond the capacity of Australia to overcome, with requisite speed. The considered observations of the representative of India regarding the reconstituted Legislative Council are most thought-provoking. I should very much like to discuss his views with him at length, but neither the time nor the place permits this now. Perhaps I pay him my greatest compliment in a negative way -- by not attempting to pick this or that point from his observations and thus give an impression of a piecemeal reply which is far less than is merited by his rounded observations, with some of which I agree, and with some of which I disagree. I should, however, like to give him one particular assurance, and I feel that, in speaking to this point, I may by implication satisfy him in some measure on points with which he is most fundamentally concerned.

He said, most rightly, that:

"... civilization cannot be regarded as consisting in the adoption of Western manners and attitudes..." (T/PV.1146, page 41),

and he developed this basic theme. The attitude he thus expressed is one which

(Mr. McCarthy, Social Representative)

has been shared by many great minds both of the East and of the West, in places of privilege and in the humblest circumstances. We would be the last to deny his thesis; indeed we would hasten to support it completely. It is no wish of the Australian Government that there shall develop in New Guinea Melanesian prototypes of Australians. It is indeed the wish, and one of the avowed purposes, of the Administering Authority that there should develop in New Guinea modern men and women who will yet remain stamped with the marks of their own individual minds, their own individual good habits and customs, what is best in their own cultures. For Australia the yardstick in New Guinea will never be the way people talk, what they wear, how closely they conform to alien patterns on social occasions. If a single yardstick can be developed, that can only be done through the creation of a national mind, unique, individual -- a New Guinea mind -- because we believe that life and men's own true dignity exist only in and through the mind, which must express itself outwardly in its own particular ways; and that only through his mind, not through outward trappings, can man achieve that purpose and that immortality, which is his great quest on earth and alone allows him to defeat the last enemy.

But its purpose can be destroyed if the mind is not allowed sufficient time to develop. In the political field, which understandably exercises so much of the attention of this Council, you have had a promise of continuing constitutional development and change, and of continuing substitution of timely and fitting institutions for worn-out ones. This promise is worthy of your greatest respect. In the new Council there must now be a period for the peoples' elected representatives to find their way and get the feel of the new ways-- indeed, they must play the leading part in shaping these ways; to develop in themselves a growing confidence and expertese; to get back to the people who elected them a flow of information regarding the new ways and the new means. The changes which have met with the approval of so many of the people should not now be the subject of attempts to force, before a reasonable term has expired, new changes which the people cannot digest. That is why the Australian Government has referred to one full term of the new Council. I therefore cannot make any promise that I shall again appear before the Trusteeship Council next year, with a new story of new constitutional changes at the highest legislative level.

(Mr. McCarthy, Special Representative)

Indeed, these should not be necessary in the immediate future, even in these rapidly moving times, for close examination of the relevant recently amended sections of the parent Act, that is, the Papua and New Guinea Act, will show you that it has been carefully planned and given such a flexible form that it can meet many changing circumstances without further change in itself -- merely through the authority it confers for action at the administrative, as distinct from the constitutional, level. For example, there is no constitutional limit on the number of indigenous people who may be appointed as official members, within the limit of the overall number itself; it leaves the way open for additional native members to be elected without change in the Act itself; the appointment of members is limited only to a certain number and is not otherwise limited on the grounds of race, religion or any similar factor; there is a wide discretion with regard to the appointment of the members of the Administrator's Council.

But, in any case, political change and progress is not measured only in terms of constitutional amendments. It is measured in a thousand different ways and, perhaps most importantly, by development in the minds of the people themselves. The Australian Government is aware of the accelerating development in these minds and will move correspondingly to provide suitable meeting grounds for the many minds concerned. I shall, therefore, appear next year, I truly hope and believe, with a new story of wide and intangible development in the Council itself, and of wide and vigorous development below that level: of an extension of Native Local Government Councils; of representation by the people on boards and bodies on which this Council and the Australian Government believe they should be represented; of impetus towards the development of common rolls, or whatever form of political machinery the people may wish to develop; of increasing participation by the indigenous people in the work of the Public Service of the Territory. All these things, and more, you may reasonably expect, but I would again emphasize that the ever-accelerating rate of orderly progress should not now be shattered by violent theoretical forays developed outside New Guinea, whether in Australia itself or elsewhere in the world, in the name of but not through the voice of the indigenous people themselves.

The PRESIDENT: First of all, on behalf of the President of the Council, U Tin Maung, who, unfortunately, is unavoidably absent today, and on behalf of myself, I should like to thank the Special Representative for his kind comments on the conduct of the sessions. I would also like to thank him, as I have before, for his whole-hearted co-operation and his patience in answering the many questions that were put to him. We are glad that it is only an au revoir on this occasion until the Special Representative appears before us again when the Council takes up the examination of conditions in Nauru.

The proposed Drafting Committee for New Guinea is composed of the representatives of Burma, India, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The Committee will meet at 10.30 on Monday morning in Conference Room 5.

Mr. McCarthy withdrew.

AGENDA ITEMS 4f and 6

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS: (continued)

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDING 30 JUNE 1960 (T/1574; T/L.1014)
- (b) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1961 (T/1560)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Goding and Mr. Nucker, Special Representatives for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under United States administration, took places at the Trusteeship Council table.

Political advancement (continued)

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, we would wish to welcome the two Special Representatives attending our meeting, the former High Commissioner of the Trust Territory,

(Mr. Nakayama)

With regard to the second question, that is, the location of the capital of the Trust Territory, I feel that the same answer I have given to the first question would apply: that the people themselves will have a hand in deciding where they would like to have the capital situated.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Of course, we agree fully with Mr. Nakayama's view that the people themselves in the Trust Territory will and must decide on all matters concerning the future of the Territory and will decide on the question of the capital, the State structure, and so on. That is why we put these questions to Mr. Nakayama as one of the representatives of the indigenous population. We would be interested to know his personal opinion in this matter and perhaps also the opinions of other leaders of the Truk District with whom Mr. Nakayama has had the opportunity of meeting. I presume that these matters are being discussed to a certain extent in the Trust Territory.

My next question is as follows: Does Mr. Nakayama know the contents of the declaration of the General Assembly on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples? Is there a text of the declaration in the Trust Territory? Has the declaration been discussed at the District Council of Truk?

Mr. NAKAYAMA: As far as materials on the intentions of the Trusteeship Council are concerned, the people of the Trust Territory have very little available. When I say "people", I am speaking of those people who are not able to read English or read any other languages. Of course, in our schools, there are times when they talk about the United Nations and, once a year, we celebrate its anniversary, which is one of the greatest occasions of the year. The people are learning more and more to know what the aims and goals of the Trusteeship System are, and my personal feeling is that in the future they will be in a position to speak for themselves.

Our Territory is not a colony -- it is a Trust Territory -- and we believe that we have more freedom and more rights in our affairs.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): We would also wish to put to Mr. Nakayama a question dealing with the possibility of the Trust Territory's obtaining assistance from the United Nations. Are the indigenous inhabitants and, in particular, Mr. Nakayama and the members of the District Congress acquainted with the fact that if the people of the Trust Territory were to decide to demand the creation of an independent State of the Pacific Islands, and were to decide to apply for membership in the United Nations, there are sources of assistance apart from the assistance that the Trust Territory now receives from the United States? I shall explain why I am putting this question. In many statements, including statements of local administrators in the Trust Territory, the thought is being introduced, directly or indirectly, that, in the event of a decision by the population of the Trust Territory that the Pacific Islands should be an independent State, assistance from the United States would stop and therefore the Trust Territory could rely only on its own resources. I should like to know whether Mr. Nakayama knows that, in the event of a decision by the people to proclaim an independent State, there are other sources from which assistance could be obtained.

Mr. NAKAYAMA: Personally, I know that there are big countries that are willing to help the small countries. With regard to obtaining assistance from the United Nations, this also is one thing that the people themselves would decide -- what assistance to accept and what assistance not to accept. If they were to be independent, I also understand that they will be on their own and they will have to raise the means to finance the budget in order to operate their government.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): If I am not abusing Mr. Nakayama's patience, I should like to put a few more questions which apply directly to the Truk District and to the activities of the Congress of that District. At previous meetings of the Trusteeship Council we have had evidence, including statements of petitioners, to the effect that the rights of District Congresses are quite limited -- that the powers, that is, are limited. We also see statements in the report of the Visiting Mission that

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

in theory these powers or rights are quite broad but that in fact they are quite substantially curtailed. We would wish to know the opinion of Mr. Nakayama, who is president of the Truk Congress, regarding the rights or powers of the Congress which he heads and, in his view, which rights should be made available as soon as possible to the District Council of Truk, for instance.

Mr. NAKAYAMA: I would like the representative of the Soviet Union to know that we do not have limited powers-- I mean, our rights are not limited. Our District Congress can pass a resolution and that resolution can become a District Order. Of course, it has to be approved by the High Commissioner, for whom we have great respect, and we believe that he can offer good constructive suggestions, so that we can improve the text of laws that the Congress works out.

We are satisfied with the present system. In our society we always, or often, look up to somebody that we will go to in order to get the final advice, and in this way we are very satisfied.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish to thank Mr. Nakayama for his answers to our questions. Perhaps in the course of our further questioning we shall have occasion to address ourselves to Mr. Nakayama again. However, in connexion with this same question of the activities of the District Congresses, we should like to ask a question of the Special Representative of the Administrative Authority -- though probably this question could best be answered by Mr. Nucker, who has spent a greater amount of time there and is better acquainted with the activities of that Congress. What sort of opinion has Mr. Nucker formed as to the activities of the Congress of the Truk District? Do the members of that Congress know well the situation in that District? Do they know the needs of the people of that District and are they, as members of the Congress, capable of deciding on questions in accordance with the interests of the people of a District, say, for instance, on the scale of the Truk District?

The PRESIDENT: Before referring that question I would like to call the attention of the representative of the Soviet Union to the statement made by the President yesterday that, in order to avoid confusion, the questions of the members of the Council would be directed to the Special Representative, Mr. Goding, who, if he felt that he needed the further comments of Mr. Nucker because of Mr. Nucker's long experience in the Territory, would refer the question to him. I will therefore refer that question to the Special Representative, Mr. Goding, either to answer or to refer to Mr. Nucker.

Mr. GODING (Special Representative): First, I would like to express at this time to the representative of the Soviet Union my appreciation for his words of welcome to Mr. Nucker, to Mr. Nakayama and to myself.

With reference to the last question, I think that it would be appropriate at this time for Mr. Nucker to make his observations on the Truk Congress as he has seen it in the past.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): As a result of working with the Trukese Congress for a number of years in the past, and, basically, because the members of that Congress are Trukese, I can answer only in the affirmative to the first part of the question. Yes, they know their District; yes, they know their people and they are quite interested in the development of the Truk District. There is no American in Truk having the knowledge of the Truk District possessed by any member of the Trukese Congress.

In elaboration of that point, the members of the Trukese Congress are learning -- and learning rapidly and learning well -- a method of government which contemplates the free exchange of thought among individuals from different parts of the Truk District, which covers an area of, I would suggest, several thousand square miles. They have not as yet completely reached the point of full understanding of congressional limitations with respect to areas of discussion, and for this reason I would suggest that for several years, or at least for a period of time, the Truk Congress needs additional seasoning. Based on the past as I have known the past, I have no doubt whatever as to their ultimately arriving at the ability to be true congressmen, in the fullest and best sense of the word, for the Truk District.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, we shall, of course, adhere to the advice you have expressed and address our questions to the Special Representative. I am sure Mr. Goding will not take offence at this, as we have a number of questions to address to him as well.

Our next question is as follows: Could the Special Representative tell us whether the officials of the Administration had read and discussed at any meetings with the High Commissioner the text of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, of the General Assembly? We should like to know what attention has been given to this document which here, in the United Nations, is regarded as a highly important one and which has direct bearing upon the Trust Territory.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Bolivia has asked for the floor.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (interpretation from Spanish): By way of facilitating our discussion, I hope my friend Mr. Oberemko will allow me to bring out this bit of information which I wish to give him before the Special Representative answers his question.

The whole thing is a question of dates. As Mr. Oberemko knows, resolution 1514 (XV) was approved in December; the Visiting Mission went to the Territory in February. I do not wish to voice any opinions, but naturally that resolution, for which my delegation voted together with many other delegations here, was in our minds. We had it in mind in more than one paragraph in our report, where we indicate that the international situation has completely changed here at the United Nations with regard to this problem. But it is quite possible that resolution 1514 (XV) at the moment when we reached the Territory was not yet known in the Territory. The resolution was approved at the first half of the Assembly's session, and we set out on our trip in February. If the representative of the Soviet Union, with his great intelligence, will read some of the paragraphs of our report, he will be convinced that the change in the international situation which had occurred in the Assembly in connexion with these matters was indeed present in the minds of the members of the Visiting Mission.

I have ventured to offer this bit of information so as to facilitate the debate. I hope the representative of the Soviet Union will understand that it is simply a question of dates. Since resolution 1514 (XV) was adopted in December and we got to the Territory in February, I believe that the resolution was not known not only to the people, but perhaps even to the Administration. Perhaps it had not yet been completely digested by many Foreign Ministers. I am not attempting in any way to excuse or apologize for the fact that the Administration in the Territory might not yet have debated this resolution; it is just a question of time and dates.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): There has apparently been some misunderstanding that has occurred here. We are not raising at all the question of whether the members of the Visiting Mission knew of the existence of the Declaration. Of course they knew of it; we have no doubt at all on that score, and therefore we are not addressing this question to the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, who is quite well acquainted with the text of that resolution of the General Assembly. We are addressing this question to the Special Representative of the Administering Authority.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

Of course, it may be assumed that means of communication are so poor in the Trust Territory that by February the inhabitants were still not aware of this important decision of the Assembly -- which affects this Trust Territory directly -- and that, the decision having been taken in December, it had not yet reached the Territory by February. However, it is June now and more than half a year has elapsed; if this text went to the Trust Territory by the slowest boat, presumably the Administration has obtained the text by now. That is why we put the question to the Special Representative and I think that we can expect to have an answer. I feel that this answer should not consist of a statement that there have been no technical possibilities; that very little time was available to the Administering Authority in which to obtain this text on the island of Guam.

Mr. GODING (Special Representative): I would only add at this point that resolutions and publications of the United Nations do arrive in the Trust Territory. The Chairman of the Visiting Mission has pointed out the problem which we have in terms of the time it takes to distribute and disseminate publications and information which arrive. But all such documents do go through headquarters and to all the districts. They are in the libraries. In my short time there, I have not, of course, been able to observe the extent to which they are picked up and discussed. I am sure that in the educational centres, in the upper schools, that actions and resolutions of the United Nations pertaining to the area in particular are discussed. In so far as the Administration itself is concerned, and discussions with representatives of the people, we have this annual Inter-District Advisory Committee which meets regularly. The next meeting will be in September. Therefore, the opportunity to discuss the resolution of last December on a broad basis has not yet presented itself. I am sure that attention will be given to this resolution in the discussions at the meeting in September.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that the situation is gradually clearing up. The text of the declaration has been received but, unfortunately, not yet discussed; such discussion is ear-marked for September of this year. Nevertheless, we should like to extend further our questions on this resolution of the General Assembly, and in this connexion I would refer to the statement of Mr. Bingham, representative of the United States, on 13 June. I should like to have some clarification regarding that statement.

We have already had an opportunity of expressing our view that the resolution of 14 December 1960 (1514 (XV)) applies fully to all Trust Territories without exception, including the Pacific Islands. Apparently, the representative of the United States has not expressed disagreement with that point of view, and he has indicated that the United States Government considered that the basic provisions of that resolution applied to this particular Trust Territory. However, we should like to have some clarification on one of the basic provisions of that resolution, which reads as follows:

"Immediate steps shall be taken in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire ... to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom." (Resolution 1514 (XV) para. 5)

This is what the declaration of the General Assembly states, whereas the representative of the United States went on to say that "the United States Government considers that the essential elements of this resolution on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples are applicable to the Trust Territory". (T/PV.1147, page 7) But in this connexion the representative of the United States merely stated that the United States Government was taking immediate steps in order to stimulate the political development of the Territory "in the direction of increased self-government". (Ibid)

Thus we see that, even in terms of form, and particularly in terms of substance, this statement of the representative of the United States is quite different from what appears in the declaration of the General Assembly. I should like to have some clarification on this point. In that statement no reference is made to an intention on the part of the Administering Authority to adopt speedy

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

action in order to hand over all authority, as stated in the declaration, to the people of the Territory; he refers only to stimulating the political development of the Territory towards increased self-government. There is no reference at all to independence as such. Last year we discussed this matter of independence for the Pacific Islands in connexion with unclear formulations on the part of the Administering Authority, and this year again we note the same circumstances. We should like to have concrete clarification on this point.

The PRESIDENT: In this connexion I shall speak in my capacity as representative of the United States.

The question posed by the representative of the Soviet Union is one of interpretation of language, particularly the language of paragraph 5 of the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. I do not feel that the statement which I made on 13 June is in any way in conflict with that paragraph, nor was it intended to detract from that paragraph as a general statement of principle which my Government is prepared to accept in terms of its general application to the Territory. We do not make any distinction in this respect between the terms "self-government" and "independence".

As I pointed out on previous occasions, the term "independence" is one which can take a number of forms. The basic question here is one of self-determination -- a choice by the people themselves as to their political future. That is what I was referring to when I said that it was our policy to stimulate that development with a view to giving to the people of the Territory free choice regarding their political future. That free choice would, of course, make independence possible in any one of various forms.

Concerning the further interpretation of paragraph 5, it is the view of my Government that this paragraph, in referring to immediate steps, means steps which must be taken in a certain direction -- not steps which must be taken on any given date to complete the process referred to.

I think this is all I can add to the statement which was made on 13 June.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I must say that we of course do not agree with such a liberal interpretation of paragraph 5 of the Declaration of the General Assembly where it is stated quite clearly that "immediate steps shall be taken"; in other words, the date or deadline itself is fixed. "Immediate steps" for what purpose? In order "to transfer all powers to the peoples" of the Trust Territories in this particular instance. That too is quite clear. Then it states at the end of this paragraph: "in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom". In other words, the text is quite clear and quite categorical. If anybody states that he agrees with this provision and is prepared to implement it, then one's actions should correspond to that. But if such actions are not undertaken then a somewhat different conclusion is reached, namely, that practical actions do not quite correspond to what is said in the Declaration. What of course is the right of the United States delegation, to have its own special point of view on this subject.

We should, nevertheless, like to have more or less concrete answers to the following points: is the independence that is bluntly stated in the Declaration of the General Assembly the policy and objective of the United States in regard to the Pacific Islands? What is the date that the Government of the United States envisages as the date for the granting of independence to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands? We have heard explanations here by the representative of the United States to the effect that the United States intends to grant to the people of the Pacific Islands this self-government, that independence has many forms. This is not what we are talking about at this stage. Of course the people of the Pacific Islands will decide. It has the full right to self-determination and to full and complete independence, as is stated in the General Assembly resolution. We should like to know whether the Administering Authority recognizes that independence as its policy in the Trust Territory. What is the date on which the Administering Authority intends to proclaim the independence of that Trust Territory?

The PRESIDENT: In my capacity as representative of the United States, I will refer to the first part of that question, and then I will refer to the Special Representative to supplement my reply.

(The President)

It is the view of the United States that its obligations with regard to the Trust Territory are governed by the provisions of the Charter and that the objectives of the Charter are the objectives to which the Administering Authority is moving as rapidly as possible. I would refer to the fact that the Charter speaks of "progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each Territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned".

With regard to the specific question, with regard to the meaning of the word "independence" as it is interpreted and as it is generally used in the United Nations, it comprises both separate independence and self-government in association with another Power in various ways; and in that sense of the word it is clearly consistent with the provisions of the Charter that that should be regarded as the objective.

I would now refer to the Special Representative the question as to whether any date may be set or has been set for the achievement of the objectives of the Charter.

Mr. GODING (Special Representative): I can note at this point the statement that I made on the opening of this inquiry, that we are in a progressive way aiming at the development of a genuine legislative body capable of representing and speaking for the people of the whole Territory somewhere within a five-year period. This in and of itself may not be the final achievement of independence within the connotation that it is used in this Assembly. We do not have a fixed target date for that final step, and I believe that we are wholly within the spirit of the Charter and the resolution adopted by the General Assembly in making this progressive advancement toward full and effective self-government and a system whereby the people will have the ultimate right and ability to express its own determination of what their future shall be.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We should like to know what the attitude of the Administering Authority would have been to the possible proposal regarding the holding of a universal referendum in the Trust Territory on the future of the Trust Territory and on

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

a concrete target date for independence for that Trust Territory so as to ascertain the wishes of the population of the Pacific Islands and so as to give them the right to self-determination, as is provided for in the United Nations Charter and in the Declaration of the General Assembly on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. It seems to me that we have already found points of contact now which consist of the fact that it is indeed the people that should decide upon this matter. We should like to know when the Administering Authority intends to hold such a referendum and to give the right to practical self-determination. Is the Administering Authority in agreement with the proposal that such a referendum be held in the Trust Territory in the very near future?

Mr. GODING (Special Representative): I believe that the question of the target date is one that must necessarily be deferred until the people have had the development of their institutions and their opportunity to come forward and express their desire for such a referendum. At the present time I do not think that we can fix within what you would call the immediate future a target date.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In that case there is some sort of vicious circle here, it would seem. When we speak of independence reference is made to the need to ascertain the views of the population. When a proposal is made to the effect that a referendum be held to ascertain that view, we are told that it is not known whether the population wishes to have such a referendum, whether it is prepared to cope with such a referendum.

Perhaps a preliminary referendum should be held on whether the population wishes to have a referendum. After all, you cannot base your policy in such a way as to pretend that the declaration of the General Assembly does not exist. The situation is now emerging in such a fashion that next year there will not be a single Trust Territory left in Africa. All of these Territories will have attained their independence, and only three Trust Territories will remain in the Pacific area, in regard to which no target dates have been set for independence.

That is why we would like the Administering Authority to set forth any urgent measures they intend to take in order not to fall behind the times and in order to carry out, in respect of the Pacific Islands, something which has already been done in regard to the other Trust Territories -- in regard to Africa, for instance, or Western Samoa.

The PRESIDENT: Before referring this question to the Special Representative, I would like to make a comment in my capacity as the representative of the United States.

The question posed by the representative of the Soviet Union appears to assume that there is a substantial desire or opinion on the part of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory for any such referendum. I would call his attention to the fact that the paragraph we were referring to before in the declaration of the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples refers to action in accordance with the freely expressed will and desire of the people. The references to actions in other Territories, of course, have followed the expression of such will and desire. But the representative of the Soviet Union appears to be making an assumption which, so far as I know, is not warranted, that there is any substantial opinion among the people of the Territory that there should be any such referendum.

I would refer the matter now to the Special Representative.

Mr. GODING (Special Representative): Inherent in this situation is the opportunity of the people to suggest through their appropriate channels that they desire such a referendum. It is in precisely this area of developing political institutions that we feel that they will have the opportunity, when they so desire, to determine when such a referendum might be appropriate.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): It seems to us that it would be more correct and quite natural to proceed on the premise that all peoples desire to rule themselves, that they desire to be fully independent and free. Basing itself on that premise, the General Assembly made its declaration. However, when we are told that there is no basis for assuming that the population of the Pacific Islands wishes to hold a referendum and desires independence and freedom, we have an even greater basis for doubting such an assertion.

If the Chairman of the Visiting Mission or its members have something to say in connexion with this series of questions, thus enabling us to benefit from the opinions and conclusions they have reached upon visiting the Trust Territory, we would be happy to hear such explanations and statements. However, if no such statements are forthcoming, we would draw the attention of the Special Representative of the Administering Authority to page 32 of the report of the Visiting Mission, where reference is made to the fact that a document should be prepared which would provide an explanation of the basic objectives of the Trusteeship System. Apparently the time has already come for explaining somewhere in a document the demands laid down in the declaration of the General Assembly. This document might be circulated among the people of the Trust Territory.

From the report of the Visiting Mission the impression is created that such a document, approved by the Administration -- a document which would contain an explanation of the purposes of the Trusteeship System -- is not in existence. We would like to know the views of the Special Representative or the representative of the Administering Authority on the proposal that at this session of the Trusteeship Council such a text be prepared.

Perhaps that text could be approved here in the Trusteeship Council. Such a document could be given broad circulation in the Trust Territory in order that there will not be any misinterpretations of the purposes and objectives of the Trusteeship System, thus enabling the recommendation contained in paragraph 71 of the report of the Visiting Mission to be carried out.

Perhaps the framing of such a text could be entrusted to the members of the Visiting Mission. They are acquainted with the conditions in the Trust Territory, and they have also sponsored such a proposal. We would consider that text and examine it in the Trusteeship Council.

We should like to know the view of the Administering Authority in that regard.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Bolivia indicated before that he had some comments to make on the statements and questions. I give the floor to the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, the representative of Bolivia.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia, Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (interpretation from Spanish): I would like to make a few comments. In the first place, when the representative of the Soviet Union spoke of resolution 1514 it is possible that I did not make myself clear when I intervened. This resolution is of great importance. My delegation voted in favour of it. The only thing I wanted to draw his attention to was that during the trip we did not find that the resolution was as yet debated in the Territory. It may have been discussed and debated later, after the visit of the Mission.

I now return to the item set forth very clearly by the representative of the Soviet Union. In the first part of my previous intervention, I said that the Visiting Mission clearly stated its point of view. In the comments which I wish to make I shall be specific and shall use the report alone. Any question falling outside the report would naturally make it necessary for the members of the Visiting Mission to get together and determine their reply. But here I think the matter is quite clear.

I should like to draw the Council's attention to paragraph 8 of the report of the Visiting Mission. This paragraph is contained on page 6. I shall read it in English because I do not have the Spanish translation. It says:

(continued in English)

"The visit of the present Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands took place two years after the visit of its predecessor. During these two years, significant developments have taken place in the world and in the United Nations, particularly in relation to Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. Several of these acceded to independence. Of the eleven Territories originally placed under the Trusteeship System, four had already attained the objective of the Trusteeship System by the end of 1960 and in respect of four others, action was under way for the termination of trusteeship. Thus, shortly there will be left only three Trust Territories, all in the Pacific area. It may be that the present Mission, in the light of these circumstances and the tempo of the times, has necessarily looked at things in the Territory from a new angle. For that reason also the Mission may have asked for more and better things and for greater and speedier efforts." (T/1560, pp. 6-7)

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

This point of view, in general terms, clarifies the position of the Visiting Mission in connexion with the changes which have occurred as a result of action by the General Assembly, including resolution 1514 (XV).

The area involved is very large. It is as large as the United States. There are many islands. In principle, I believe that the heterogeneous factors -- the differences in languages and customs and the large distances involved -- made it practically impossible for the eventual unification of all these islands. However, it was remarkable to find in the younger generations the beginning of a sense of unification. In other words, the possibility of establishing some unity among the islands is really a complex, important and difficult task.

Further, I fully respect the intelligence and comprehension of the representative of the Soviet Union. We did not have to put in the report that from a sociological point of view we have societies that are in a state of conformity or withdrawn, or in a state of revolution or evolution. Traditionally, the people of the islands of the South Pacific are ready for peaceful development. There is no conflict between the chiefs and the younger generations. We state in another part of the report that it is remarkable that in all the islands there is a rising generation of young men ready and willing to understand the destiny of each island.

Perhaps the representative of the Soviet Union may ask us why we did not touch upon the problem of the definitive goals and the possible independence of the islands. In annex III, page 9 of the report of the Visiting Mission, we set forth a question which was debated among the inhabitants of Yap. Here we find a traditional society, very conservative and very independent, so independent that it could not be assimilated by any of the Administering Authorities -- the Spaniards, the Japanese, the Germans and not even the North Americans. They indicate that they want complete independence after some twenty years. This is the case of one island.

Each of us may sometimes have felt a greater personal liking for one or another island. There is one island which I liked very much. It captivated me because of its political maturity. I am referring to the Island of Kusaie, which has 3,000 inhabitants. These people handle their problems with complete

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

independence. They asked me whether the immediate independence of Kusaie could be proclaimed. Should we apply the concept of self-determination to an island of 3,000 inhabitants? In spite of the high political development of this island, as Chairman of the Visiting Mission I could only tell them that they should firmly maintain their independence and should understand that others had not yet reached that high political level of development.

All these problems show that the process of unification is a slow and long process, but it is not as slow as I had thought. The students of these Micronesian Islands in Hawaii, for example, no longer speak like the men of Truk, Ponape or Palau. They speak as men from Micronesia. They are beginning to have a sense of unification. This is especially noticeable among the younger generation. I believe that Mr. Nakayama belongs to this generation, and when he spoke here perhaps a bit timidly, or perhaps he was just manifesting the courtesy of the natives of those islands, he told us that "in our society, after we deliberate we need advice". This indeed is more or less the way in which these societies are constituted. They have democratic instincts and they also have great respect for constituted authority.

I believe that while I have covered the field somewhat superficially, at the same time I have touched upon the central problems of these islands. I agree fully with you when you speak of the need to accelerate the political process. In the report we ask for an acceleration in the establishment of committees and legislative powers in the islands, and the Administering Authority has accepted our suggestion. At the same time, I must add that in other islands, for example, the Palau Islands, there is an active political awareness.

In conclusion, I wish to make my point of view clearly understood. Let us suppose that there were no Administering Authority in the islands. These islands, as in the past, would be fragmented and open, open to the predatory actions of pirates and exploiters. Therefore, the establishment of a political awareness must be undertaken by the Administering Authority. It is not an easy task, but it is not impossible. I say this in all good faith and in the hope that the representative of the Soviet Union will understand the objectiveness and sense of realism with which the Visiting Mission worked in the islands. I have expressed opinions on these matters which are to be found within the framework of our report. Of course, there may be some marginal observations from other members of the Visiting Mission.

(Mr. Salamanca, Bolivia)

I have already said that I had the privilege of being the Chairman of a Visiting Mission with very great political acumen. I believe that the Trusteeship Council would greatly benefit from hearing the points of view of the other members of the Visiting Mission.

I hope that I have responded to the points brought up, quite rightly, by the Soviet Union representative.

Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom): Not for the first time I, and I believe the other members of the Visiting Mission, have occasion to be extremely grateful to our Chairman for the eloquence with which he has succeeded in expressing views which I, certainly, and, I feel sure, the other members of the Mission, fully share. I would not wish to start a custom in this Council -- a quite unnecessary one -- by which all of us would feel obliged to say that we agreed with what our Chairman had said on our behalf; I think that that can always go without saying.

There is one small point that I would like to add to what the representative of Bolivia has just said. I do so only because it relates to an aspect of the Soviet Union representative's remarks on which he laid particular stress and on which he particularly invited the views of the Visiting Mission; and it is a point which I do not think was directly dealt with by our Chairman.

If I understood him rightly, the Soviet Union representative asked when it was intended that the referendum on the future of the Territory should take place. I think that he went on to say that it was evident from first principles that the referendum should take place now, or in the very near future. This was a question which the members of the Visiting Mission discussed extensively -- both separately in informal conversations, and as a Mission, in formal conversations -- with the representatives of the Micronesian people whom we had every opportunity to meet and with whom we had every opportunity to talk on these subjects. I think, incidentally, that it is fair to say that the Declaration on colonialism was very much a background to many of these conversations -- that was certainly true of the conversations which I, myself, had.

(Mr. Caston, United Kingdom)

This is my impression -- and, from conversations I have had with the other members of the Visiting Mission, I think that they share it: Although among what I might call the more politically conscious members of the Micronesian community, of which Mr. Nakayama is himself an outstanding example, there is every awareness that at some time in the future -- I think that Mr. Nakayama, in his statement the other day, used the words "appropriate time" -- the Micronesian people will have the opportunity and the duty to determine their own destiny, nowhere did we have expressed to us the opinion that that should be done now. In fact, in many cases the contrary was true, as is apparent from some of the passages of the report which the Chairman of the Visiting Mission has just quoted. These people felt that this was a decision that they had to take themselves, but that there were certain things which they wanted to do first and they did not know quite how long those things would take.

I think that it is fair to give the Trusteeship Council this impression, which is perhaps not stated explicitly anywhere in our report. The consultation was a subject which came up in discussions between the members of the Visiting Mission and the Micronesian people, but nowhere was the feeling expressed that that consultation should take place now, or, indeed, in the very near future.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I think that I am right in saying that all the members of the Visiting Mission viewed a United Nations mission as having a dual function: first, and foremost, to observe in the Territory what exists there by way of facts or opinions and to report them to the Trusteeship Council, and secondly, to serve in its peregrinations as a means of communication of information -- incidentally, naturally -- about the United Nations. Our Visiting Mission performed both parts of that function.

Coming back to this question of independence, I should like to bring to the Trusteeship Council's attention that the word "independence" or the concept of independence is not unknown in the Territory; I wanted to make that point because it had not been made. A careful perusal of the report itself should demonstrate that. For example, on page 6 of annex III to the report we have reproduced the remarks made by the former High Commissioner, Mr. Nucker, to the

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

Fifth Conference of the Inter-District Advisory Committee. Mr. Kucker told the Conference that the Visiting Mission would be arriving in the Territory and that this Mission might seek to gather information on certain points. He said that the first question which the Mission might ask and on which the people might wish to convey their opinion to the Mission was: Will Micronesia become a completely independent country operating solely within its own ability? There then followed a questionnaire, which was circulated in different versions -- and I think that the fact that there were different versions was unfortunate -- in all the Districts. A perusal of these remarks by the High Commissioner will show that the concept of independence, or one of the possibilities of self-determination -- namely, independence in the form of a sovereign, national State -- was before the people.

I am not sure whether there were copies of the Declaration in the Territory. But I am quite sure about one thing: each of us in our own briefcase had a copy or copies of the Declaration. I do remember our discussing the contents of the Declaration not only at the headquarters in Guam but in District headquarters and, as the necessity arose, in the various District centres, with the District Congresses, either collectively or with individual members. There should therefore be no doubt about this. This point was brought out very clearly, I think, by the Chairman of the Visiting Mission and the United Kingdom representative. What is exercising the minds of the people at the moment in various Districts -- I think in all Districts, with one possible exception -- is not whether they are going to be independent tomorrow or five or ten years hence, but whether their economy has come to an adequate point of development; they are not worried so much about their social or even their educational advancement. Many doubts and many anxieties exist on the subject of economic development, and these the Mission's report has attempted to bring to the attention of members of the Trusteeship Council. For that reason, I think that the Visiting Mission also gave rather more detailed attention to economic conditions than to any other conditions in the Territory. That is the main question.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

With regard to targets and dates, as I said, it is not the function of the Mission as a collective body to set or to suggest target dates; normally, under the declaration, for example, it would be the function of the Administering Authority.

Now, speaking for my own delegation, our view has been that in determining these things the Administering Authority concerned should take into account the expressed or elicited views of the people concerned. By way of that, we did not come across anything -- and as the representative of the United Kingdom stated, no desire was expressed to the Mission by the people in any of the districts as to the holding of a referendum. I should like to add to that, that perhaps the District of Saipan was an exception, and for the reasons which are well known to the Council, the Mission took exception to the effect that a plebiscite was in fact conducted -- and I think we took exception to that very rightly; the circumstances are enumerated here. The Chairman mentioned the case of the people of Kusaie wanting to be independent. I do not think this is something to be very proud of. I think this is perhaps a sign of immaturity when a small island out of a group of islands wants its own independence. But, national consciousness is developing. Now, if I may express a personal opinion, I think it can be further promoted by the adoption of certain ways that we suggest in our report; for example, augmenting the powers, the scope, the functions of the Inter-District Advisory Committee, its rapid conversion into a legislature to knit the people together into one whole and to enable the people in these representative bodies to give thought to these crucial matters and to express opinions on these matters in due course.

Another course we have suggested is that the powers of the District Congresses might be augmented. There was some misunderstanding on that too, and since I have the floor, I will try to clarify that. What we said in the report on that particular matter does not amount to saying that these bodies are in any sense restricted or debarred from discussing certain matters. That is not the case. In fact, I think we did not come across any instance of a resolution or a proposal adopted by a District Congress which was rejected by the High Commissioner; I do not think there was any instance. But we did draw attention

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

to the financial limitations under which these bodies have to function, limitations which render their work of rather a very limited nature. If these bodies could be rapidly developed, the Inter-District Advisory Committee could be encouraged further in the direction to which it is moving and encouraged rapidly, and if, as we suggest, the senior administrative posts in the District, let us say, the assistant district administrator and the district administrator -- naturally after suitable training -- transferred to the people, the Territory will be so many steps nearer the goal of self-government or independence.

Therefore, if I may express a personal opinion here, I think it might serve the Territory and the Administering Authority, if rapidly succeeding targets were to be formulated in these two or three specific fields which will carry the Territory forward in a more planned way and more quickly towards the day when they may come to demand a referendum or a plebiscite on the larger question.

Mr. ADRIAENSSEN (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to add a few comments to what has just been said by my colleagues. I completely agree with them. My comments are as follows. During our whole trip around the Territory we were impressed by the maturity of the inhabitants and their political awareness, no matter what class they belonged to. If we could draw two conclusions from the various contacts, it would be that first of all there exists a very great desire to have in the Territory democratic institutions and organizations, and on the other hand, there was a great desire, especially among the younger generation, to achieve a unification of the Territory -- and the Administration is making great efforts along these lines.

But, if such a desire does exist among those who are active in political life, it is especially along a very simple direction. They simply want democracy which will be real and effective. The inhabitants intend to build up their political system as a tree which grows naturally from the soil of their islands. I think this is a feeling which should be applauded.

(Mr. Adriaenssen, Belgium)

The same thing can be said with regard to the sense of unity which most of the younger generation has, and which they are attempting to build up in their Territory. This is something very vivid and alive especially among the students with whom we had contact. But, in speaking of this unity of the Micronesians, we have often noted among the younger generations a desire not to compromise the introduction of this idea -- which is a very new idea among the older generation -- by adopting a process which would not correspond to the rate of development which they think most appropriate.

An awareness of unity is something essential if we wish to have a good and proper idea of the rate of development which must be established there. I think we ought not to upset those who are working to establish territorial unity on a democratic basis by introducing ideas from abroad which do not correspond to the rate of development which would be most appropriate. I do not think we should slow up the rate of development, but we need not impose upon them dates which would not correspond to their freely expressed wishes. We should not impose upon them formally independence and so forth which would not be freely chosen by them. We realize that these younger generations are on the road towards their objectives and that we should not upset them.

The PRESIDENT: I think the Council may be interested to know at this point -- and I would like to take this opportunity to say -- that we have with us as guest today a distinguished delegation from the Congress of the United States, including the Chairman of the Territory on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, Mr. Wayne Aspinoll. They are here as guests, indicating their interest in the proceedings here and in this Territory for which, as members of Congress, they share in great part the responsibilities of the Administering Authority.

I believe that there is a question pending to the Special Representative; I do not know whether he remembers it; if he does I will give him the floor.

Mr. GODING (Special Representative): I should like to have the question again.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have had here a rather interesting exchange of opinions, although most of the time the members of the Visiting Mission have spoken, and that is quite understandable. We are particularly grateful to the Chairman of the Visiting Mission and the members of that Mission for having shared with us their more detailed views on this subject than had been possible to do within the framework of the report. It stands to reason that such a report would be limited by its very size and scope. Of course, we shall not now come to any decision or express our opinion or give any evaluation of the various comments. I can only note at this stage, from the statement of the representative of Belgium, that there was such a definite colonialist odour, that this was a colonialist interpretation of the declaration; of course, we do not doubt at all that the same opinion was held by him in his conversations with the younger generation of the Trust Territory. But that is his opinion, it is right to have such an opinion.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

As for the views and comments expressed by the representatives of Bolivia and India, we find much of interest in them and much objective information on the conversations which they had in the Trust Territory. We consider their comments to be quite valuable. The participation of such members has ensured the success of the Visiting Mission and also the fact that we now have a report of the Visiting Mission which, of course, cannot be compared with any of the previous reports. We see that this report of the Visiting Mission differs, as does night from day, from the report of the Administering Authority, where not a word is mentioned about shortcomings and where there are no recommendations at all such as are contained in the report of the Visiting Mission. However, that is something that we can perhaps discuss somewhat later. I should now like to limit myself once again to an expression of thanks to the members of the Visiting Mission for having let us know what their views are on the question raised by the Soviet delegation.

I should now like to repeat the pending question, since it has indeed been possible to forget it in the time that has elapsed.

The PRESIDENT: Before the representative of the Soviet Union takes up that matter, I should like to give the floor to the representative of Belgium, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. ADRIAENSSEN (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I wish to thank the representative of the Soviet Union for his comment. I do not understand very well the meaning of "colonialist odour", but I would not like to get involved in that. However, where does the representative of the Soviet Union see any colonialist aspects in my interpretation? Is it because I said that I hoped that the people might attain independence, or is it because I hoped that they might preserve their unity? Which of these two had that colonialist odour to it?

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republic)(interpretation from Russian): I believe that I would not be able to explain as well just what this particular odour consisted of, and perhaps the representative of Belgium would

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

best be advised to read his own statement in the official records of our meeting today.

As for his last comment, to the effect that he is in favour of the unity and independence of the Territory, we very much welcome that sort of statement. But the important element, of course, is the element of time. The General Assembly has spoken of the immediate granting of independence, has spoken in favour of putting an end to colonialism, without any further procrastination or postponement. The question of time is the one that should guide us. Of course, one may recognize independence and unity in principle, but, when one gets down to actual target dates, that is where the real position and the real policy of the respective protagonists is exposed. I think the representative of Belgium understands just what is involved here and where our divergencies lie.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I want to say just one brief word to remind the Council and all others, lest an erroneous impression should develop, that the report of the Visiting Mission is a unanimous report. I am sure that the representative of Bolivia, the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, relishes and welcomes as much as I do the special tributes paid by the representative of the Soviet Union to us and to the views we have expressed today. But, if I may say so, the wisdom -- if there is any -- and the strength of this report lies to a very great degree in the fact that this is a report which is unanimous and which was arrived at by mutual discussion, exchange of ideas and views, negotiation of those views, negotiation as to the expression of those views, not only between the representatives of India and Bolivia, who sometimes disagreed, but also between the representatives of India and Bolivia, on the one hand, and the representatives of the United Kingdom and Belgium, on the other.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Perhaps now we should revert to the question I was asking. On page 32 of the report of the Visiting Mission, reference is made to the fact that, in the view of the Mission, the Administration should prepare a document for use all over the Territory, explaining the objectives of Trusteeship, so that the population might acquaint itself with these objectives and express its views

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

concerning its future. In that connexion, we ask whether the Administering Authority agrees with this recommendation of the Visiting Mission and whether the delegation of the United States would agree to having such a document, with the objectives of Trusteeship laid down in it, formulated at the present session and examined in the Trusteeship Council and approved by it for the widest possible circulation and dissemination in the Trust Territory.

The PRESIDENT: Before referring this question to the Special Representative, I should like to say, in my capacity as representative of the United States, that we would welcome the expression of views of other members of the Council on this subject. We have no fixed views on the way in which a document such as this should be prepared. But it is the offhand impression of my delegation that, in the normal course, it would be the responsibility of the Administering Authority to consider this recommendation and to act upon it and that it would not be in accordance with the customary procedures of this Council to proceed in the manner suggested by the representative of the Soviet Union.

As regards any comment on the recommendation that he might care to make, I will refer the matter to the Special Representative.

Mr. GODING (Special Representative): At this time, I should like to note that there are three paragraphs under the heading "Discussions in other parts of the Territory concerning its future" -- paragraphs 70, 71 and 72 -- paragraph 71 being the one suggesting the preparation of a document. I am most appreciative of the exposition which has been made by the Chairman and other members of the Visiting Mission, which has served to provide a very helpful background to the formal report of the Mission. I think that it highlights most effectively the fact that the Mission, in formulating its recommendations, has not noted any demand for an immediate referendum; that, while the people were interested in the future and discussed questions concerning the future of the Territory, it was noted, perhaps somewhat critically, that there was a lack of clarification throughout the broad area, the extent of which has been highlighted by the representative of India.

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

The exact terminology used in reference to the preparation of a document which will help clarify thinking in the Territory includes the words "at the appropriate time" -- that "the people themselves would at the appropriate time have the opportunity of freely expressing their wishes concerning their future..."
(T/1560, para. 71)

(Mr. Goding, Special Representative)

We are in complete agreement with that objective and, as I stated previously, we accept very willingly the suggestion that such a document be prepared. I am not personally acquainted enough with the procedures of the Trusteeship Council to know whether it would be appropriate for the Council to participate in the drafting of such an instrument, but we are certainly willing to circulate any objective statement concerning the objectives of the Trusteeship Council and the Trusteeship System.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Our next question refers to the third page of the introductory statement by the High Commissioner, Mr. Goding, where reference is made to the intention of the Administering Authority to appoint Micronesians in some districts to the posts of assistant district administrators. If I am not mistaken, the Special Representative, in reply to a question, explained that the first Micronesian assistant district administrator was to be appointed in 1964. We should like to know, firstly, whether the Administering Authority has any plans and what the approximate target dates are for appointing Micronesians to the posts of district administrators -- not assistant district administrators but actual district administrators or commissioners. I would recall that we have already spoken about this at the previous session of the Trusteeship Council. A whole year has elapsed since then, and we should like to know whether the Administering Authority has any plans now in this respect.

Mr. GODING (Special Representative): Considering the fact that there are within the whole Territory six posts of district administrators in the six districts that we administer, plus the fact that we are dealing with the qualifications of individuals, I think that it is almost completely unfeasible to set a fixed target date. All that I could add to that is that, as the Micronesians who have the preparation, the background and the administrative ability reach the point, they will certainly be considered for any position up to and including district administrator, but to my mind it is completely unfeasible to set a target date with precision and to say that we will definitely have a specific candidate ready to take over a given job in 1965 or 1963.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Of course, it is possible to discuss this matter quite concretely. In the course of our discussion here in the Trusteeship Council we have determined, for instance, that Mr. Nakayama, as a representative of the younger generation of Micronesians and as President of the Truk District Congress, has acquired experience, has the necessary qualifications, is well acquainted with the affairs in the Truk District, knows the local language and is a direct representative of that indigenous population. Could Mr. Nakayama not be appointed this year -- if he agrees, of course -- say, to the post of assistant district administrator? Within a few months, say, when he has acquired the necessary experience, he might be appointed district administrator, and the American specialist might be his deputy and offer him advice and assistance if needed. So, if we were to handle this matter practically, would such a situation be possible, in the view of the Administering Authority?

Mr. GODING (Special Representative): I would respond to the latter part of the question first by saying that such a situation would be possible. I would not at this time suggest -- nor would it be appropriate, I think, to suggest -- that a decision of this sort be made here. This is a decision that necessarily must remain in the hands of the Administering Authority. To elaborate on the point of what possible appointments might be made, I might add that the last district administrator appointed, while not a resident of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, is a native Samoan. He is also a young man born within the island area of the Pacific who had training in the United States and who was the last Governor of the American territory of Samoa. We have, in that sense, demonstrated that it is certainly within the capabilities and within the framework of our thinking that any qualified citizen of Micronesia would certainly be given consideration for appointment to the highest positions within the Territory.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We understand, of course, that the appointment to any post in the Administration is a matter in the hands of the Administering Authority. That is why we address ourselves to the representative of the Administering Authority

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

with such a recommendation, namely, that specific consideration be given to appointing Mr. Nakayama initially to the post of assistant district administrator and subsequently to the post of district administrator. Of course, I do not know whether the recommendation of the Soviet delegation would help or hinder the appointment of Mr. Nakayama to that post, but we are convinced that within the Trust Territory such educated and well-trained young men as Mr. Nakayama are in sufficiently large number, and obviously the Administering Authority should take steps in the immediate future towards appointing Micronesians to important posts within the Administration itself. If this recommendation of ours is considered by the Administering Authority and practical steps taken in that direction, we believe that only benefit for the Trust Territory will result.

In this connexion, we should like to revert to the discussion we had at our last meeting on whether the Administering Authority was not too hasty in recalling some specialists from the Trust Territory under the pretext of the replacement of the United States personnel with Micronesian personnel. While we welcome this replacement, we note that it is being effected only in the Departments of Education and Public Health. The replacement of Americans by Micronesians in important posts in the Administration itself is something we have not yet seen; nor has it been mentioned by the Visiting Mission either, as far as we know. Therefore, we should like to know what is at the bottom of such a policy on the part of the Administering Authority. What are the principal motives in this? Why is it that American physicians, teachers and other specialists are being recalled -- in other words, the categories of specialists that the Territory needs and that should be expanded. All members of the Trusteeship Council welcome the sending of more American teachers and doctors there, but at the same time we consider that it is necessary for the heads of the Departments of Education and Public Health to be Micronesians. However, the Micronesians need assistance. So I think that -- as the Visiting Mission quite appropriately stated -- these specialists were removed too hastily. This step is all the more incomprehensible when one takes into account the fact that in the Administration itself the Micronesians in important posts are few in number, if there are in fact any at all.

(Mr. Nucker, Special Representative)

administrative assistants of Micronesians. We have developed committees in the various districts to work with the District Administrators, who daily are giving information and advice as to the operation of the area. We have dealt at length with the training program taking place for young Micronesians, leading towards administrative work of the highest order.

I do not feel -- and particularly in view of the attitudes of the majority of the Micronesians -- that we need retrogress by returning American doctors for work in the districts simply because there is a feeling that an American doctor has a higher degree of skill and we may have pulled him out too suddenly. I hope, and I am certain, that Micronesians who show ability will be rewarded in the future as they have been in the past, and I want to close my remarks simply by assuring the representative of the Soviet Union that there was no pretext used in the replacing of Americans by Micronesians.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish to indicate to the Special Representative that we did not speak of any pretexts as such. We were interested in the reasons which caused the Administering Authority to carry out such a policy. The word "pretext" itself carries with it some sort of negative connotation. We are putting a question and we have clearly stated that we wish to know the reasons, and consequently we do not understand why the Special Representative has gone on to speak of pretexts. We are not interested in pretexts, but in reasons. Perhaps, of course, the misunderstanding comes about through the interpretation.

But as for the fact itself, it was brought out in the report of the Visiting Mission and their comments on this subject. We consider those comments correct and we cannot but wonder when we hear disagreement voiced concerning such a well-founded opinion. After all, it is difficult to understand how one could say that if in a certain hospital there is not one doctor but two, that would be worse, or that in a certain school there is not one teacher but two, that also would be worse. We are not saying that American specialists must be left in the supervisory positions in the fields of health and education; we say that at the head of these departments there should be Micronesians. As we see it, since the Administering Authority is responsible for the administration of the Trust Territory, it is the duty of the Administering Authority to help

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

There, replacement of Americans by Micronesians is not being carried out, and therefore we wish once again to express our agreement with the comments of the Visiting Mission on this subject, and we should like the Administering Authority to indicate what the reasons were for which the Administering Authority, instead of increasing the number of doctors and teachers in the Territory, actually removed a small number of such specialists from the Territory. Was this because of considerations of economy, budgetary considerations?

Mr. GODING (Special Representative): With respect to the first part of the representative's statement, I would like to assure him and the Council that when and if the opportunity presents itself, his suggestion concerning the availability of Mr. Nakayama will certainly not work to Mr. Nakayama's disadvantage. But that suggestion was not in any sense necessary for me, personally, in examining any credentials in connexion with filling any vacancy in any high post in the Administration.

Now, on the larger question as to what has been done and the motives behind the shift of personnel, I think that we have taken a very sound position. The Special Representative, Mr. Nucker, has been close to this for a long time, and I would like to give him the microphone in order for him to discuss the matter of the replacement of American personnel by Micronesians.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): First, I would like to call attention to a statement which was made to the effect that we may have appointed Micronesians to American posts under a pretext. I wish to assure the representative of the Soviet Union that at no time during the past six years, when this policy developed, did I deal in pretexts. It has been the aim, as expressed in past meetings of this Council and by members of this Council, that we should use Micronesians when those Micronesians were capable of properly performing the jobs involved. We proceeded on the basis of appointing Micronesians when they could take over the work. We have recognized the ability of the Micronesians. We have talked more about the replacement of Americans formerly in health and education because these two areas are of extreme interest and importance to members of this body. I should like at this time to state that we have also placed Americans -- district finance officers, district supply officers, district land title officers; we have made

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

the population. Now, what should this help consist of? I do not believe that the Trust Territory has a surplus of Micronesian physicians, so that it does not know what to do with them. After all, that is the situation, and Mr. Nakayama knows this full well. If in addition to a Micronesian doctor there were also an American doctor, that would not in any way reflect any doubt as to the competence of the Micronesian doctor; on the contrary, both of them would be working together for the betterment of the Micronesian population. It is for this reason that we were surprised that the most urgently needed specialists were actually being recalled from the Territory, that is to say the doctors and teachers, exactly the categories of which the Territory stands in greatest need.

As for the administrative posts themselves, we see no change. There is not a single Micronesian in the post of Assistant District Administrator, nor is there a single Micronesian in the post of District Administrator, and it was in connexion with this that we put our question.

If I may, I would like to go on now to the next question.

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

From the report of the Visiting Mission we have the impression that the initiators of this business of setting up the so called plebiscite in Saipan on 5 February 1961 -- on the eve of the arrival of the Visiting Mission -- were the officials of the Administration itself; appropriate speeches were made, etc. We should like to have this point properly clarified. Is our impression correct that this so called plebiscite was the result of a sort of push, as it were, initiated by local administrators?

The PRESIDENT: I shall refer that question to the Special Representative, who may wish to refer to Mr. Nucker.

Mr. GODING (Special Representative): I can answer the question. The plebiscite was not initiated by the Administration officers in the Saipan District under the Navy. It was initiated by the action of the local municipal or District Congress and it was approached by the Administration with a completely "hands off" attitude. Mr. Nucker might elaborate on that point if he will.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I have nothing further to add. The statement as made by Mr. Goding is correct.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Of course, in the light of such statements on the part of the Administering Authority, it is rather awkward to consult either the Chairman of the Visiting Mission or the members of the Mission, particularly since the documents appended to the Mission's report really give grounds for a conclusion to the effect that this plebiscite, if not directly, at least indirectly, was prompted, or hinted, or encouraged by the Administration. However, I shall not put such a question to the Visiting Mission since its members might find it awkward to answer.

I should like to take this opportunity to express our agreement with the statement made by the Chairman of the Visiting Mission on behalf of the Mission, and also the statement in the report, to the effect that this parody on a plebiscite cannot, of course, be taken seriously when an attempt was made to cut off one isolated district of the Territory and to represent things in such a way as to make

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

it appear that the population wished to separate itself from the rest of the Trust Territory and to decide its destiny separately. We agree fully with the Visiting Mission that the future of the Trust Territory should be decided for it as a whole and not for any individual region.

If there are no further comments on this point, I should like to proceed to my next question.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): I should like to make a clarification of the statement of the Visiting Mission which appears on pages 28 and 29 of its report.

There are certain occasions, during a visit to a Trust Territory, when a Mission finds itself faced with a critical situation. Sometimes we must assume that such a situation concerns the approval of the Council. That is why the Mission unanimously made the statement which appears on these pages. But the important point, which of course does not appear in the report, is the effect of this statement.

Naturally, after various meetings in Saipan we spoke individually with representatives of the Municipal Council of Saipan which acts as a congress, and we said that this point of view would possibly not meet with the support of the Council. Naturally, this is just a provisional impression, and that is why it does not appear in the report. But we had the impression that this statement of ours somewhat relaxed the tension among the two parties in Saipan.

Any other step which may be taken with regard to the eventual possible separation of Saipan from the rest of the Territory would, of course, affect the integrity of the Trusteeship Agreement. But this is another matter. The most important thing, of course, is to know whether this position which we took finally would be accepted and understood. We are inclined to think that this may be a personally optimistic statement, made in the hope that the problem would disappear. At the same time, we have noted with sympathy a statement by the Special Representative to the effect that, in future, Saipan would be represented on the Inter-District Advisory Council. Naturally, delegations must take this into account at the end of our conclusions. We think that we should defend the unity of the Territory fully. This is our point of view, and perhaps

(Mr. Salamanca, Polivia)

some delegations will eventually recommend the administrative unity of the whole Territory so that this sort of situation will not arise again in the future.

The fact that the armed forces, because of their organization, have greater resources, and that Guam is nearby, means certain relationships, but there is, as the representative of India has indicated; the problem of the integrity of the Territory. We have defended this concept in our statement, and we hope that it will be born in mind in the general conclusions to be reached by the Council.

Once again I would say that in making the statement which appears on pages 28 and 29 -- and here I address myself to the representative of the Soviet Union -- it was not because we wanted to know how the problem had arisen. Here we have the elements which we found in the Territory, and our intention was to eliminate possible separation by making a clear statement, and I believe that this statement may cause the people of Saipan to reflect upon the matter.

Mr. ADRIAENSSEN (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I should like to add a personal comment on the subject of the referendum. One of our colleagues has qualified this as a Gallup Poll. This is a definition which puts the problem in its proper place and which is acceptable to the members of the Visiting Mission and the members of the Administering Authority. I think that the word "referendum" as used is a very apt one for an area where there is no other institution. We have seen another manifestation of this, namely, the qualification attributed to the Saipan Congress, which called itself a legislature. I think that this is an inadequate term, but that the problem is a simple one and that we all agree with the actual over-all substance of it.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I think that in the course of the various statements in the debate on this question we will have an opportunity to quote portions of the annexes to the report of the Visiting Mission, namely, statements of the local administration in the Saipan District. This will probably cast some light as to whose initiative it was in this referendum or plebiscite, or whatever you wish to call it here, or even a Gallup poll, as it has now been called, or simply a consultation for the sake of satisfying curiosity.

We now wish to address ourselves to that part of the report of the Visiting Mission which deals with the consequences and problems arising out of the unhappy incidents which took place in regard to several Islands in the Trust Territory as a result of the former testing of nuclear weapons in this Trust Territory, namely, the after-effects of radiation on a rather large sector of the population of the Trust Territory at that time. In paragraph 196 of the report of the Visiting Mission it is indicated that on the Island of Rongelap there was a group of doctors appointed by the United States Atomic Energy Commission and that this group had made a special examination of persons who were affected by radioactive contamination. We should like to know if the Administering Authority could make available to the members of the Trusteeship Council the report of this medical group on the results of the examination of the population of the Rongelap group.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to reply in my capacity as representative of the United States.

As I stated yesterday, the report of the Commission from its inquiry last year is a public document and is available; it has never been anything other than a public document. I am not aware that the current report has been printed, but there is no reason why copies of that document should not be made available to the members of the Council as soon as it is printed.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): We would not of course have made a request to have this report disseminated among the members of the Trusteeship Council if it were not an open and unclassified document. That is why we applied to the Administering Authority

to be good enough to make this report available to us so that we might acquaint ourselves with it and perhaps put any questions we may have and express our opinions on it. This would only be a question of about thirteen copies of that report. Perhaps the representative of the United States might take the necessary steps so that these copies could be made available to the Trusteeship Council, and we should be very grateful to him if he made such an effort.

The PRESIDENT: We shall endeavour to get such copies for the members of the Council. I am not sure just how long that will take, but we will get them as rapidly as possible.

Mr. OBERCMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am very grateful to the representative of the United States for this answer, and I of course have great faith in the effectiveness of the actions of the United States delegation, and this is in all other matters. We look forward to seeing this report in the next few days or in the near future. I do not know if Mr. Nucker is thoroughly acquainted with the work of this medical group. He was High Commissioner in the Territory at the time. However, I should like to ascertain one aspect of the matter, and again the report of the Visiting Mission and the concrete recommendation which is contained in the report of the Visiting Mission prompts this. When this group of doctors examined the population of Rongelap Island, when did this occur? Apparently this examination took a certain amount of time. Were they specialists living with the inhabitants on that Island? Were they on some other island or in some other location or were they living there with the population throughout the time of the examination? In this connexion, in order not to put any further questions of this kind separately, we should like to know what the view of the Administering Authority was on the recommendation of the Visiting Mission to the effect that some steps should be taken which would allay the fears of the population of Rongelap Island which is alarmed at the effects of atomic radiation. What is the view of the Administering Authority in this connexion? Does it agree with the proposal of the Visiting Mission that high officials of the Administration should be sent to the island of Rongelap in order to live with the indigenous population and thereby show them that indeed

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

there is no radioactive contamination present there or that the level of radiation is normal or acceptable and that therefore no further danger exists? Of course, I must qualify this by saying that this does not in any way alter the effect or the harm done by previous radiation.

Mr. GORING (Special Representative): I should like to ask Mr. Nucker who was there at the time to answer the question.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): The most recent survey by the medical group was made this past March. The duration was ten or twelve days at Rongelap. The medical team was in daily contact with the Rongelapese. They were housed aboard the ship which was necessary to carry them and their equipment to Rongelap.

The findings of that group have not as yet been put in printed form, to the best of my knowledge. I imagine they would have returned home sometime in April. The very technical nature of such a report and the depth of the types of technical tests taken, I think, would eliminate the possibility of having a written report at this moment. I would be happy to make it available if they did have one; that would be a matter to check. In the past we have had an American living on Rongelap. In fact, the young man lived there, as I recall it, close to two years, being away just a few months from the Island from time to time. An American was on the Island for the better part of two years. I think it would be fair to say that the summary findings of this past group communicated to me was to the effect that at the present time there was no evidence of illness on the part of the people which was occasioned by or which could be attributed to radiation fallout. The information given me was quite encouraging to me so far as the health of the people of Rongelap was concerned.

(Mr. Nucker, Special Representative)

This is not intended in any manner to mean that they did not suffer from a fallout. I do not believe that the sending of another American to Rongelap would totally -- it might help, again -- allay the fears expressed to the Visiting Mission.

As I expressed to this Council last year, I was quite concerned about the psychological impact on the people of Rongelap of the number and scope of the medical examinations made. I truly believe that those examinations are from time to time necessary because we want to ensure that our knowledge of these people is a continuing knowledge. I did not want in any manner to block the flow of knowledge necessary to proper treatment, if needed, of these people. On the other hand, I did not want our scientists to become so enamoured of the gathering of information that their mere presence so often caused people to think they are sick simply because a doctor is in their midst, thus creating the psychological atmosphere we are trying to eliminate.

I am very pleased that the scientists and the doctors of the Atomic Energy Commission understood our point and our attitude. We have been able to come to an agreement which will, in the doctors' eyes, give adequate and sufficient checks and permit them to call in their scientists often enough to ensure proper care and proper knowledge, in the meantime arranging that our own doctors maintain constant contact with the area.

This is one of those extremely regrettable and unfortunate incidents which from time to time occur in this world. The United States is doing, and wants to do, those things which will make for a quick recovery with respect to their emotional outlooks as well as any possible physical problems which might have occurred.

With respect to radiation fallout, we want to do everything we can to help the people. On the other hand, the very nature of the problem -- the very nature of the area in which the people live -- is such as to cause this to be a problem which will require time and changing attitudes to take place.

I do not think the Micronesians believe that the Americans have any fear of living on the island. Our Director of Health, Dr. MacDonald, the man in charge of the entire health programme in the Trust Territory, has personally lived on the island as long as three weeks at a time.

(Mr. Nucker, Special Representative)

In closing, I simply want to state that I hope the problem continues to dissipate itself with time. The people today are not nearly so worried, not nearly so emotional, as they were three, four or five years ago. I am gratified to be able to state that in general their health is good. The scientists have attributed no illness at this time to the fallout.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We, of course, reserve the right to put further questions on this subject after we have received the report of the medical team that examined the people.

As for the last assertions of the Special Representative of the Administering Authority, that apparently the situation limits itself only to the psychological aspect of the matter and that these various emotions and concerns, and what not, are decreasing, we would wish to say that we have evidence to the contrary -- evidence to the effect that as a result of the radiation of a fairly large proportion of the population of Rongelap Island there are physical, tangible injuries, and concrete manifestations, indeed, in the form of stilted growth and skin illnesses.

In the report of the Visiting Mission we see a number of facts which indicate that physical injuries of the inhabitants of Rongelap Island do take place and that, therefore, it cannot be said that no harm has been done to their health, that their health is good and all is well.

In paragraph 195 of the report of the Visiting Mission it is stated that during the Mission's visit to Rongelap many people complained that since the fallout -- since the fallout, not before -- they were not maintaining good health. In other words, the patient says that he is ill and the doctor tells him, "No, you are all right". Is that the way we should understand this?

The report goes on to say that they have complained of general conditions of fatigue, listlessness, body aches and stomach disorders. Certain cases of abnormal or deformed children born to parents living on Rongelap were mentioned, as was the frequency of miscarriages.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

Another series of complaints concern the contamination of certain locally grown foods and fish caught in the lagoon. This paragraph further states that a Micronesian health aide living on Rongelap has confirmed the prevalence of these occurrences. He said that this occurred after the eating of fish caught in the lagoon and, more specifically, that boils appeared inside the mouth.

Thus, there is material evidence which indicates that not only emotional but physical harm has been done. I feel that this is the light in which we should view this whole problem. We cannot say that there are no further after-effects, that their health is good and that there is no further need to talk about the matter.

I repeat, we reserve our right to revert to this question after we have received the report of the medical team that examined the people on the Island of Rongelap.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

I should like now to put our final question, which refers to page 91 of the report of the Visiting Mission. Paragraph 202 of the report refers to the fact that the Mission noted the statement made to it by the Administering Authority that it has no plans to resume tests in the Territory and that it hopes -- it is difficult to know whether it is the Administering Authority that hopes or whether it is the Visiting Mission that hopes -- that no nuclear, or thermonuclear tests will be carried out in the future in the Trust Territory. In this connexion, we would wish to know whether the delegation of the United States in the Trusteeship Council can make an official and formal statement here on behalf of the Administering Authority that never in the future will there be any tests of nuclear or thermonuclear devices in the Trust Territory.

The PRESIDENT: Speaking in my capacity as representative of the United States, I must limit myself to the statement previously made to the Visiting Mission, that the Administering Authority has no plans to resume tests in the Territory. I cannot go beyond that statement.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I must confess that this is not quite the answer that I would have liked to hear from the Administering Authority. We would have wished the Administering Authority to associate itself with the hope expressed in the report of the Visiting Mission. Moreover, we consider that it is the duty and the obligation of the Administering Authority to assure the Trusteeship Council and the population of the Trust Territory that in that Trust Territory never again in the future will any tests of nuclear weapons be held, since this runs counter to the objectives of the Trusteeship system and it is contrary to the interests of the indigenous population of the Trust Territory.

However, if the representative of the Administering Authority is unable to make any official statement or to issue an official assurance, perhaps at one of our meetings in the near future when we discuss the substance of the matter, after the necessary consultations, such assurance may be forthcoming from the Administering Authority to the Trusteeship Council. We do not believe that the matter can be left to rest there. The matter is quite important and we believe

(Mr. Oberenko, USSR)

that both the Trusteeship Council and the population of the Trust Territory must be quite clear as to the intentions of the Administering Authority in this field.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.