



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1263
24 June 1965

ENGLISH

Thirty-Second Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWELVE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 24 June 1965, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. NAUDY

(France)

1. Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: report of the Drafting Committee
14 (a) (continued)
2. Organization of work

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1263 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 4 (a)

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS:
REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE (T/L.1096, L.1097/Rev.1) (continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will now resume the voting on the report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which appears in document T/L.1096. I suggest that we follow the procedure we adopted yesterday, that is, that before voting on each paragraph of the report, delegations may make any comments or any particular clarifications they wish to make concerning the paragraph in question or the amendments thereto. I would hope that these comments will be as brief as possible and that speakers will not indulge in the luxury of returning to questions which have been dealt with at some length in the general debate on the Pacific Islands.

We had reached paragraph 14 at our meeting yesterday. Since no representative wishes to make any comments on this paragraph, I put it to the vote.

Paragraph 14 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Does any representative wish to make any comments on paragraph 15?

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I address myself to the Soviet amendment in paragraph 5 of document T/L.1097/Rev.1, and I would express the position of my delegation in this matter in the following way.

First, we have noted that the defence appropriations in relation to the United States Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are quite apart from the appropriations relating to the administration and the advancement of the Trust Territory. They do not come out of the Territory's budget; they are a completely separate item on the budget of the United States itself.

Furthermore, the special strategic significance of this Territory has been recognized by the General Assembly and this recognition has been given expression through the development of particular machinery here in the United Nations. Apart from this, the whole implication of the paragraph, we believe,

is directly contrary to the information placed before this Council regarding the increasingly large sums of money which the United States Government is making available to promote the welfare of the people of this Trust Territory.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will vote on the Soviet amendment which proposes replacing the existing paragraph 15 by a new paragraph which appears in paragraph 5 of document T/L.1097/Rev.1.

The amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would request a separate vote on the last sentence in paragraph 15.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, we shall vote first on the last sentence of paragraph 15, which begins with the words "At the same time" and ends with "internal revenue".

The sentence was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 15 as a whole was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 16 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 17 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As regards paragraph 18, I should like to remind the Council that the Soviet Union has submitted an amendment which appears in paragraph 6 of document T/L.1097/Rev.1, an amendment to replace the first sentence in paragraph 18 by a different text.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): With regard to the Soviet amendment contained in paragraph 6 of document T/L.1097/Rev.1, I should simply like to note the view of my delegation that the eyewitness account given, I think, the day before yesterday by the representative of New Zealand is alone sufficient to refute the implications and allegations contained in this amendment.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As regards the statement just made by the representative of Australia about assertions allegedly contained in the Soviet amendment to the draft conclusions and recommendations, the Soviet delegation would like to remind the representative of Australia that only two and a half weeks ago the Council had before it a petition signed by Dr. Hicking and ten other members of the medical services in the Trust Territory, in which the Administering Authority was accused of having misinformed the Trusteeship Council with regard to the state of affairs in the field of medical services in the Trust Territory. At that time the Soviet delegation informed the Council that this petition, which was addressed to the Council on 30 April 1965, contained new information with regard to the conditions in the Trust Territory.

As regards the reference made by the representative of Australia to the statement of the New Zealand representative, I should like to remind him that the Visiting Mission of the Council went to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands over a year ago, and its information cannot be compared in any way with the new information available to the Council in the petition to which I referred.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I attach particular weight to what I called the eyewitness account of the representative of New Zealand. I think that the point is in part well taken by our colleague from the Soviet Union that a year has elapsed since our colleague from New Zealand saw these things regarding which he spoke the day before yesterday. But I think that the representative of the Soviet Union has probably missed the point. I was referring to the things which the representative of New Zealand said he saw with his own eyes, that is, the equipment in the hospitals, the extent of the hospitals' programmes, and all the rest of it; that could scarcely have disappeared in those twelve months.

Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom): I should simply like to say that, if my memory serves me right, some time ago this matter was indeed considered in this room and agreement was reached that there should be an impartial investigation by the World Health Organization. It seems to me, therefore, otiose that we should return to this matter at this particular juncture.

Mr. FOFIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to make two comments in connexion with what has just been said by the representatives of Australia and the United Kingdom. First, if we compare the characteristics of the two sources which we have available to us, we cannot fail to note that on the one hand we have a visitor to the Trust Territory, even if he is a chairman of a Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council and that on the other hand we have people who work and live in the Trust Territory, who are there constantly and not for just one month, and who thus have the possibility of acquiring a more profound knowledge of the true state of affairs in the Trust Territory.

Furthermore, I should like to say that the statement by the Australian representative implied that a year ago the Soviet delegation apparently agreed with the information supplied by the Visiting Mission. That was not so. At the thirty-first session of the Trusteeship Council the Soviet delegation said that it did not intend to share the enthusiasm expressed by the Visiting Mission regarding the state of affairs in the field of medical services.

As regards the remark made by the United Kingdom representative, of course he is right. Therefore, in this case we should pay all the more attention to the subject matter under discussion at this stage. It would only be fair if the Drafting Committee refrained from submitting any conclusions or recommendations on this question precisely because the Council has decided to invite the World Health Organization to carry out an investigation of this matter. Whether individual members of the Drafting Committee desire it or not, a definite point of view is being foisted upon the Council, a point of view which does not take into account the new information contained in the petition received from Dr. Hicking and ten other persons. The Soviet delegation naturally cannot agree with this. It would be ready to withdraw its amendment if the Council decided not to submit any opinion in the matter until such time as the World Health Organization, if it carries out an investigation, completes it and submits its results to us.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I hasten to say that I made no implication regarding the views of the Soviet Union. Our colleague from the Soviet Union is perfectly capable of expressing his own views. I was expressing my views on the basis of an eye-witness account. Simply to put his mind at ease, I would say that I was making no implication whatever regarding the views of the Soviet Union.

I believe that the point made by the representative of the United Kingdom is very well taken. We have decided to call for an investigation of the circumstances by the World Health Organization. The representative of the Soviet Union has just pointed out that he is perfectly happy to abide by the verdict of the investigation of the World Health Organization in this matter.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I should like to say to the representative of the Soviet Union that the formulation of the sixth Soviet amendment seems to attempt to disqualify the findings of the Visiting Mission to the Pacific Islands, when its report objectively sets forth the deficiencies in the medical field as well as the good aspects. For this reason, my delegation will vote against the amendment.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation remembers quite well the appeal addressed to us by the President at the beginning of the meeting. However, we cannot fail to speak once again in order to request the representative of Australia in the future not to put any words into the mouths of others. The Soviet delegation has not said anything about the conclusions which the World Health Organization might reach. We have not commented in any way on the possible outcome of its investigation. For this reason, the representative of Australia should understand that the position that he might take on this issue need not necessarily be the position to be adopted by the Soviet Union on the same matter.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): There may be a misunderstanding between my Soviet colleague and me in this matter. I was not attempting to put any words in his mouth. I would not do that; I would not have any words to put into his mouth. I was not implying anything with regard to the position of the Soviet Union.

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

in this matter. I was merely expressing my own views. Perhaps those views came through incorrectly in the interpretation, but I do hasten to set his mind at ease in this matter.

Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom): I would suggest that since many of us have expressed our views on this particular point and since no doubt the members of the World Health Organization will be able to read in the verbatim record exactly what we have said, we might pass on to the next subject.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has a sufficiently good memory to refer not only to one part of the statement made by the representative of Australia, but to the statement as a whole. The representative of Australia used the English words "to abide by". The Soviet delegation would like to say in this connexion that it prefers to adopt a position not in advance but only after the material has been studied. I think that each responsible delegation will share the point of view of the Soviet delegation in this matter.

I should also like to say in this connexion that this statement by the Soviet delegation in no way casts any doubt on the results of the investigation by the World Health Organization. We always reserve the right to make our judgement on each subject after we have received sufficient information, but not before.

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): I would agree with the statement made a moment ago by the representative of the United Kingdom that the position of members on this question is already well known. The New Zealand position was set out the day before yesterday by Ambassador Corner and has already been alluded to several times this afternoon. In presenting his eye-witness account, he stressed that he had seen the medical services in the Territory as a layman, but indicated that he was impressed, with some few reservations, by what he saw.

(Mr. McArthur, New Zealand)

I would point out at this stage that the report before us simply welcomes the statement made by the Administering Authority. Where the Council states that it is encouraged by the progress made, this is simply a matter of verifiable facts. The Council draws the attention of the Administering Authority to the various recommendations and observations made by the World Health Organization. There is no intention in the text as it stands to prejudge the matter.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will now vote on the sixth Soviet amendment (T/L.1097/Rev.1).

The amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 1.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With respect to the vote on paragraph 18 of the report of the Drafting Committee, the Soviet delegation would like to request a separate vote on each of the three sentences of the paragraph.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will now vote on paragraph 18, and in accordance with the request just made by the representative of the Soviet Union, will vote first on each of its three sentences separately.

The first sentence was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The second sentence was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The third sentence was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 18 as a whole was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 19 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to remind the Council that the Soviet delegation has submitted an amendment in the form of a new paragraph to be inserted before the present paragraph 20. That amendment appears in paragraph 7 of document T/L.1097/Rev.1.

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): I wish to apologize for introducing a sub-amendment at this stage in our deliberations, but I think that there are ways in which the new paragraph suggested in the Soviet amendment could become acceptable. It is the understanding of my delegation that the Administering Authority is in fact making use of United Nations programmes of assistance. We have noted the statement made by the representative of the Administering Authority in that connexion. We should therefore like to suggest a sub-amendment to the Soviet amendment, as follows:

Starting with the word "recommends" in the second line of the Soviet amendment, the paragraph would read:

"recommends that the Administering Authority continue to make use, in the interests of the Micronesians, of the opportunities for education and vocational training available to the inhabitants of the Trust Territory under United Nations programmes".

That would be the end of the paragraph.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Indeed, in the statement by the representative of the United States, there was a reference to the fact that some persons from the Trust Territory went to other colonial Territories and also to individual independent States within the aid programmes of the United Nations. For this reason, when the representative of New Zealand amends our own amendment, he is presumably mixing up two things which are quite distinct. In its amendment, the Soviet delegation says that:

"The Council, taking into consideration the Trust Territory's requirements of highly qualified personnel, recommends the Administering Authority to use, in the interests of the Micronesians, the opportunities for education and vocational training available to the inhabitants of the Trust Territory under the United Nations fellowship programme for inhabitants of Trust Territories."

In other words, the Soviet amendment speaks of the special United Nations programme for inhabitants of Trust Territories.

Thus, we are dealing here with two completely different and distinct matters. On the one hand, we have the United Nations aid programmes; and, on the other, we have the special United Nations fellowship programme for inhabitants of Trust Territories. In these conditions, the sub-amendment proposed by the New Zealand delegation is unacceptable to my delegation. But, inasmuch as a further consideration of this sub-amendment is necessary, we suggest, if the New Zealand representative is going to press for it, that we use rule 57 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council. However, before I read that rule, I should like once again to draw the attention of the Council, and also of the officials of the Secretariat concerned, to the fact that we have not yet received the last edition of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council in Russian. I now read rule 57, in English:

"Reports, draft resolutions and other substantive motions or amendments shall be introduced in writing and handed to the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General shall, to the extent possible, circulate copies to the representatives twenty-four hours in advance of the meeting at which they are to be considered. The Trusteeship Council may decide to postpone the consideration of draft resolutions and other substantive motions or amendments, copies of which have not been circulated twenty-four hours in advance."

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): I should like to point out, in reply to the statement by the Soviet representative, that my delegation does not feel it is confusing various United Nations programmes in any way. I might explain the matter simply in this way: It is our feeling that it is up to the people of Micronesia and to the Administering Authority to determine which United Nations programmes it should make use of.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of New Zealand has tabled a sub-amendment to the seventh amendment submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union. The representative of the Soviet Union has requested the application of the provisions of rule 57, which reads, in part:

"The Trusteeship Council may decide to postpone the consideration of draft resolutions and other substantive motions or amendments, copies of which have not been circulated twenty-four hours in advance."

Does any member of the Council have any comments to make on the proposal made by the representative of the Soviet Union?

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I believe that the point raised by the representative of the Soviet Union in relation to rule 57 of the rules of procedure is valid. I also believe that the sub-amendment submitted by the representative of New Zealand is designed to bring the Soviet amendment more into conformity with the situation as we understand it.

Mr. President, you are faced with a time factor in the Council and it would be desirable for you to finish the business of the Council with the utmost expedition. Therefore, my delegation, while admitting the validity of the point raised by the representative of the Soviet Union, would be perfectly happy to vote on the Soviet amendment as it stands at the present time.

Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America): The rule which has been cited, rule 57 of the rules of procedure, has as its purpose to make it possible for all of us in the Council, in the event that new proposals are submitted -- particularly if they are complicated or if they are lengthy amendments that are difficult for us to take down -- to have twenty-four hours to study these proposals in writing. It has been a common practice, however, and it is the practice of all bodies of the United Nations, to deal with brief amendments of one or two words without such a delay. I remember innumerable occasions when the Soviet Union itself made brief proposals and representatives agreed to deal with them immediately. The other day the Soviet Union introduced a very long series of amendments and it was requested that they be put in writing. They were put in writing in document T/L.1097/Rev.1. But I believe that it has been our practice and it should continue to be our practice to get on with our work, not over anybody's dead body but through understanding efforts. We can deal with this simple amendment, which all of us understand.

If that is not the case, if that is not the decision of this body, then I suppose we should have to delay the matter for a day while this amendment is put in writing and circulated. I think that would be an unconscionable delay of our work, which has already been greatly retarded.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I hope that members of the Council realize that what they heard from the United States representative a few moments ago was an interpretation by the United States delegation of rule 57 -- nothing more and nothing less.

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): The sub-amendment which I moved was presented solely in order to try to provide some means whereby the Council would be able to adopt the greater part of the text of the draft amendment put forward by the delegation of the Soviet Union, which in spirit is something that we think would be worth adopting and that could well be reflected in the report which emerges from the Council. My delegation, however, would be perfectly prepared to leave a decision on the procedural matter which has been raised in the hands of the Council.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I believe that that would be the wisest solution and it is the solution which I have had in mind for some minutes now. If in fact the Council feels that the sub-amendment is a fairly brief one and that it would delay us too much to wait for it to be distributed in writing, we can immediately take up the sub-amendment of New Zealand and then the Soviet amendment.

Therefore, I should like to have the opinion of the Council on this matter. I shall ask those members of the Council who feel that we should continue with the discussion immediately to raise their hands.

I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, the Soviet delegation would like to know on what rule of procedure you are basing yourself in putting this proposal to the Council.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I just read out the third sentence of rule 57, on which I am basing myself. I shall repeat it:

"The Trusteeship Council may decide to postpone the consideration of draft resolutions and other substantive motions or amendments, copies of which have not been circulated twenty-four hours in advance."

What I am now asking is whether or not members of the Council feel that the consideration of this draft sub-amendment, the text of which has not been circulated twenty-four hours in advance, should be deferred.

Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America): I want to be perfectly sure that I understand what we are voting on. As I understand it, an affirmative vote would delay the discussion for one day. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Yes. The Council will now proceed to the vote on the proposal. Those who wish to defer the consideration of the sub-amendment will vote in favour, and those who wish to consider it immediately will vote against.

The proposal was rejected by 4 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I take it, therefore, that the Council wishes to take a decision now on the sub-amendment submitted by the representative of New Zealand.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation cannot regard the decision taken by the Council as anything but an action under rule 105 of the rules of procedure which reads as follows:

(spoke in English)

"When the Trusteeship Council is in session, a rule of procedure may be suspended by decision of the Council."

(continued in Russian; interpretation)

The first portion of rule 57 states quite clearly that amendments must be handed in to the Secretary-General -- I repeat this, to the Secretary-General -- in writing, twenty-four hours prior to the meeting of the Trusteeship Council at which the amendment is to be considered. The Soviet delegation also cannot fail to note that when it suits the Council -- the majority of which is quite well defined -- it decides to act with regard to the rules of procedure as it thinks fit.

Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom): I should like to say, Mr. President, that I will support the ruling that you have made as President of this Council.

Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America): I should like to register the view of my delegation that we did not suspend rule 57; we simply applied it in a sensible way, in the way in which it is applied over and over again in all organs.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall now vote on the sub-amendment submitted by the representative of New Zealand. The purpose of that sub-amendment is to add the word "continue" after the words "Administering Authority" and to delete some words in the Soviet amendment.

Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council): If I have taken down correctly the sub-amendment submitted by the representative of New Zealand, it is as follows: Insert in the second line, between the words "recommends" and "the Administering Authority" the word "that"; after "Administering Authority" insert the words "continue to make use" and delete the word "to"; between the words "Micronesians" and "the opportunities" insert the word "of"; delete in the last line the word "fellowship" and leave the word "programmes"; delete also the words "for inhabitants of Trust Territories". The amendment would thus read as follows, if sub-amended as suggested by the representative of New Zealand:

"The Council, taking into consideration the Trust Territory's requirements of highly qualified personnel, recommends that the Administering Authority continue to make use, in the interests of the Micronesians, of the opportunities for education and vocational training available to the inhabitants of the Trust Territory under the United Nations fellowship programme."

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): There is just one slight difference in what I originally proposed. It should read "under United Nations programmes", without "the".

Miss ERCOKS (Liberia): I should like the representative of New Zealand to explain what are his objections to the word "fellowship" and the words "for inhabitants of Trust Territories". We are referring to the inhabitants of the Trust Territories and we are referring to fellowships for these inhabitants under the Trusteeship System.

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): I shall be very pleased to give that explanation to the representative of Liberia. As I explained in a previous intervention, there are various United Nations programmes available. It is the view of my delegation that it is for the people of Micronesia and for the Administering Authority to determine which of those programmes they wish to use.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation is encountering the same difficulties as the representative of Liberia. The New Zealand representative is telling us about various programmes within the United Nations framework. Inasmuch as the sub-amendment submitted by New Zealand, if adopted -- and there cannot be any doubt as to the outcome of the vote in this Council -- would completely alter the nature of the amendment submitted by the Soviet Union, the Soviet delegation would like to have a further explanation with regard to what programmes the representative of New Zealand has in mind. The Soviet delegation would be grateful if the representative of New Zealand would enumerate and describe them. If we do not get these clarifications, the Soviet delegation will be unable to take any position on this question because we will not know what we are dealing with and what we are being asked to vote on.

As regards the Soviet amendment, as the Council knows, it deals with a specific programme of United Nations fellowships for inhabitants of the Trust Territories. For this reason, the widening of the meaning of the Soviet amendment

that is proposed in the New Zealand sub-amendment means in essence changing the meaning of the amendment. It was for this reason that the Soviet delegation thought that the Council, and not only the Soviet delegation, needed some time in order to understand the meaning of the New Zealand sub-amendment. That is the reason why we voted for a 24-hour deferment of the vote on the New Zealand amendment.

Today the representative of New Zealand twice said that it was for the Administering Authority and the people of Micronesia themselves to decide which programmes, within the United Nations framework, they wished to utilize and which they did not wish to utilize. The Soviet delegation would like to remind the representative of New Zealand that the people of Micronesia have no opportunity to have a say in the matter. As you will recall, the Soviet delegation said that the Administrator has attached to him a special fellowship committee which consists, if I am not mistaken, exclusively of United States nationals, and in which there is no Micronesian participation. Thus, the opinion of the Micronesian people is not represented in that committee, the functions of which include the taking of decisions on requests and recommendations by local organs in the Trust Territory.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I must apologize for taking the floor again but I am not sure that the explanation given by the representative of New Zealand has cleared up the ambiguity which has arisen during the discussion. I should like to say, for example, that I personally was asked in Micronesia by some women to use my influence so that more United Nations fellowships would be given to women in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In view of my promise to do something about it, I feel that I cannot support the sub-amendment of the representative of New Zealand in its present form.

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): I think in fact that the point raised by the representative of Liberia is precisely the one which my delegation's amendment is trying to meet. It broadens the range of the United Nations programmes to which we are indicating there should be recourse.

Now, as to the point raised by my Soviet colleague, we have heard from the representative of the Administering Authority earlier in our discussions in the Council that eight students have already made use of certain United Nations programmes; we also understand that attempts have been made to make use of the specific fellowship programme mentioned in the Soviet draft amendment. I would suggest that it might possibly be useful to the Council, before proceeding, to hear some further elaboration from the representative of the Administering Authority in this regard.

Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America): I would be glad to talk again on this subject. As you recall, the Special Representative had a great deal to say on it, and I also spoke earlier on it.

The scholarships to which the representative of New Zealand just referred are eight in number. He was referring to a statement that we made that eight applicants from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands have studied under United Nations programmes, specifically the Technical Assistance Scholarship Programme, since July 1963. There were, as I recall, an average of two a year prior to that also. It has been going on for a long time. These eight people went to five independent countries ---not colonial countries, as the representative of the Soviet Union said, although I thought they were independent too; but I am referring to Japan, Western Samoa, the Philippines, India and Ceylon.

With respect to another remark that the representative of New Zealand made, he said that one student had made some effort to study under a scholarship offered by an individual nation to Trust Territory inhabitants. That is correct. He did not try and fail; he simply considered an offer by an independent State to Trust Territory people and he also considered a different scholarship in the Philippines, deciding upon the latter. I had cited this earlier to show that students do receive this information and study it and make up their own minds about it.

(Mr. Dickinson, United States)

With respect to the statement that the representative of Liberia made about women wanting more scholarships, she did not specify which kind they meant, which kind they were talking about. It would perhaps be of interest to know that Rose Makwelung, whom she may have met in the Territory, did become a United Nations scholar last year in a scholarship programme that took her to three countries. This was a Technical Assistance programme. I do not know if the representative of Liberia has met Miss Makwelung, but she may well have, for apparently she is a rather prominent person in the Territory.

I do not know if there is any further information the Council needs on this point.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I would like to ask the representative of New Zealand if he would accept a sub-amendment -- or a sub-sub-amendment -- to the New Zealand sub-amendment, to the effect that at the end of his sub-amendment would appear the words "including the fellowships and scholarships offered by Member States".

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): I think the sub-sub-amendment, as the representative of Liberia calls it, is one which my delegation would be fully prepared to accept. I merely have some slight doubts about the actual wording of it. I think we might possibly need to repeat again at the end "under the United Nations programmes". This seems to make clear that these are fellowships and scholarships offered under the United Nations programmes. But certainly the general spirit of the Liberian amendment is something that would be acceptable to my delegation.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): What I wished to say was that if, after the word "programmes" in the sub-amendment of the representative of New Zealand, he would add "including the fellowships and scholarships offered by Member States", I would then be in a position to support the sub-amendment.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The farther we go into this question and the more statements we hear, including those by the delegations of New Zealand and the United States, the more obvious the ambiguity of the New Zealand sub-amendment becomes. All the statements we have heard have not dissipated the impression of ambiguity in respect of the sub-amendment that the delegations of Liberia and the Soviet Union have received. On the contrary, they have made this ambiguity all the more pronounced and have shown that the sub-amendment pursues a definite objective, an objective which we have often seen manifested here in this Trusteeship Council. The fact is that some members of the Council are prepared blindly to reject any proposal -- even though it deserves the most careful consideration -- reflecting the true state of affairs in the Trust Territories.

What the representative of the United States has told us here regarding the number of persons who have used fellowships within the Technical Assistance programme paints the unattractive picture of conditions in the Trust Territory in the most telling fashion. The representative of the United States tells us that eight persons have used scholarships under the United Nations programme -- eight people in twenty years. And she is proud of that. Any self-respecting Power would be ashamed to quote such a figure; indeed it might even seek to conceal it. But the United States delegation triumphantly describes the heights it has reached: it has sent eight people in twenty years to other countries to receive training within the framework of the United Nations Technical Assistance programme.

Inasmuch as it becomes clear that the sub-amendment submitted by the New Zealand delegation relates to a matter connected in no way whatsoever with the point raised in the Soviet amendment, the Soviet delegation regards that sub-amendment as out of order.

(Mr. Fotin, USSR)

The representative of New Zealand may, of course, submit any amendments he wishes, especially since in this Council even the most absurd amendments and proposals can be submitted. But inasmuch as we are dealing with a quite different matter, and as the New Zealand representative has been unable to reply to the question of the Soviet delegation and to clarify his position, the Soviet delegation considers this sub-amendment to be out of order.

As regards the further sub-amendment proposed by the representative of Liberia, the Soviet delegation feels that, in the present circumstances, when we do not have before us the text of the New Zealand delegation's sub-amendment, it would be very difficult to determine in what way the first part of the sub-amendment would relate to the further sub-amendment proposed by the representative of Liberia.

If the Soviet delegation understands correctly the sub-amendment proposed by the representative of Liberia, its adoption and the adoption of the New Zealand sub-amendment would signify that the Council recommends that the Administering Authority, inter alia, should continue to make use of the scholarships provided by the United Nations scholarship programme for inhabitants of Trust Territories. We should then have the most obvious non sequitur because, as we know, despite the years of the existence of the United Nations scholarship programme for Trust Territories, not one inhabitant of Micronesia has utilized one of these scholarships. When one of them apparently tried to avail himself of an opportunity offered within the framework of that programme, it seems that he was very soon told what place he should occupy in Micronesian society.

Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America): I have asked for the floor in exercise of my right of reply.

Once again the Soviet representative has quoted the representative of the United States incorrectly. He did so only minutes after I had made a statement. He said just now that the United States representative had stated -- or admitted, to use his word -- that there had been only eight United Nations technical assistance scholarships utilized in twenty years. That is not what I said. I think that everyone will recall -- and I wish that he would recognize his error --

that what I said was that since July 1963, eight such scholarships had been used; that prior to that, they had used, on the average, two a year -- possibly two or three, but I shall stick to what I said. I should like to think that the Soviet representative's remark was an inaccuracy, an accidental misstatement, although it happens so frequently that I find it hard to believe it was accidental. I have a high regard for the intelligence of the representative of the Soviet Union and I cannot see how he could have said that. However, I have corrected the record.

He has also resorted to something that has delayed the work of the Council day after day; and that is, distortion of statements made by the Administering Authorities, thus requiring them to take up the time of the Council in refutation, as they must do. He said that when one Trust Territory inhabitant --

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I apologize for having to ask for the floor on a point of order, but we have encountered, not for the first time in the Trusteeship Council, a situation in which the United States delegation tries to indicate to other delegations, particularly my own, the manner in which we must behave in a particular instance. He says that the Soviet delegation has been delaying the work of the Council. I cannot but protest against such a statement inasmuch as the Soviet delegation is here to represent the point of view of its Government on all the questions on our agenda --

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom): I should simply like to say that I do not think the representative of the Soviet Union is speaking on a point of order. He is speaking on a matter of substance. I should like him to restrict his remarks to the point of order on which he asked for the floor.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America): I should like to continue the statement which I was making when I was so rudely interrupted. I had hoped for a moment that the representative of the Soviet Union was interrupting me to say that I need go no further because he admitted his error. He did not do so, and I shall have to continue.

I was speaking of the Soviet representative's resorting to deliberate distortion. Referring to a statement that I had made, he said that when one of the Trust Territory personnel did undertake to study an offer, having been provided with all the information about it, he was told where he stood in society. The implication, of course, was that he was told that he could not accept the offer and would have to go somewhere else. That was a distortion, and that is what I wanted to say.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): In order not to prolong the discussion further, I wonder whether the representative of New Zealand would be willing to revert to the suggestion made by the representative of Australia to let the original amendment remain and each delegation vote in accordance with its own opinion.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The representative of the United States makes very free use of such words as "errors", "distortions", and the like as applied to statements of the Soviet delegation. Perhaps the representative of the United States will also describe as "distortion" the Soviet delegation's statement that approximately two years ago the Legislative Council of the Marianas -- one of the district legislatures in the Trust Territory -- adopted a special recommendation that the inhabitants of the Trust Territory should be allowed to utilize the programmes granted by the States Members of the United Nations within the framework of the United Nations programmes.

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): I regret that this degree of confusion had to arise and that the Council had to spend such a long time on this point arising from what, in the mind of my delegation, was a very simple amendment designed to be as helpful as possible. In all the circumstances, I think that my delegation could do no better than to withdraw its amendment on the understanding that, as an indication of our feelings in the matter, we shall abstain in the vote on the Soviet amendment.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The sub-amendment submitted by the representative of New Zealand has been withdrawn, and we shall now, therefore, vote on the Soviet amendment appearing in paragraph 7 of document T/L.1097/Rev.1.

The amendment was rejected by 3 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 20 was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As regards paragraph 21, I should like to remind the Council that the Soviet delegation has submitted an amendment to this paragraph, namely, to add a new sentence to the end of this paragraph. This amendment can be found in paragraph 8 of document T/L.1097/Rev.1.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I see in paragraph 8 of the Soviet amendments that there is a reference to deleting a certain portion of the paragraph after the words "the Council feels". I think that a compromise was made and that a sentence was to be added at the end of the text without any deletion. The words "and therefore recommends" should thus be used.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As the members of the Council will recall, the Soviet delegation met the wishes expressed by the representative of Liberia and, as may be seen from the revised text of the Soviet amendments, the first part of the original amendment of the Soviet delegation is not included in the revised text. The revised text merely contains the amendment with regard to which the Liberian delegation did not have any objection.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Having noted that the delegation of the Soviet Union has withdrawn its first amendment, for which I should like to commend our colleague from the Soviet Union, I should simply like to say this. Addressing myself to the substantive matter before us of the establishment of this junior college, I would recall that I addressed myself to this matter during the general debate when I said:

"In this connexion, I would refer in passing to the suggestions which have been made for the establishment of a junior college in this area. I would be the last to deny that there might be a need for such an institution. But I would note that the lack of this seems to me certainly not to be retarding the educational development of the people at the present time, and will not in the immediate future. They have in the neighbouring territory of Guam a college of a high order. They have open to them similar institutions in Hawaii. I am inclined to think that in the present circumstances concentration on a policy of primary and secondary education along the present lines of development would be preferred." (1252nd meeting, page 11)

Thus, having no objection in principle whatever to the proposal now before us, but feeling, as I have expressed it, that the needs of the people are being adequately met at the present time, and as the educational needs of the people would be better catered for by a rather narrow concentration, my delegation will abstain in this vote.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall now vote on paragraph 8 of the Soviet amendment.

There were 2 votes in favour, 2 against and 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall now read out rule 38 of our rules of procedure:

"If a vote other than for an election is equally divided, a second vote shall be taken at the next meeting or, by decision of the Trusteeship Council, following a brief recess. Unless at the second vote there is a majority in favour of the proposal, it shall be deemed to be lost."

I shall therefore suspend the meeting for a few minutes.

After a brief recess in accordance with rule 33 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.

There were 2 votes in favour, 2 against, and 3 abstentions. The amendment was not adopted.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation, in connexion with the vote that has just been taken, cannot but express its congratulations to our colleague on the right.

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): I wish to make a brief statement in explanation of the abstention of my delegation in the two votes that have just taken place. My delegation certainly fully supports the adoption of measures designed to lead to the establishment of an institution of higher education in the Territory. However, we did not feel that we could support the precise wording of the Soviet amendment, in particular the word "immediate". I would recall that, speaking in this debate two days ago, the leader of my delegation made the following remarks:

"Therefore, I think that, for the Council to be responsible, it should not recommend the adoption of immediate measures, but could well recommend a further consideration by the Administering Authority of the feasibility of establishing this institution, and even give some more positive indication of the Council's support for it." (1261st meeting, pp. 57 and 58-60)

Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom): In explanation of my vote, I should like to recall that in the course of the debate here some while ago I said:

"It was particularly satisfying to note the increase in the number of students enjoying higher education outside the Territory from 161 to 196 in the year under review."

I then said:

"Doubtless the Administration and the Congress of Micronesia will give due attention to the question already raised here about establishing institutions of higher education in the Territory itself."

It will therefore be seen that I have no quarrel with the sponsors of the amendment about its purport, that is the purport of the establishment of institutions of higher education. To my mind, however, this is reflected in the report before us, document T/L.1096, in which, in paragraph 21, it is stated, inter alia;

"... reiterates its previous recommendation that renewed consideration be given to the establishment of a junior college of Micronesia."

My explanation of vote is similar to that of the representative of New Zealand.

Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I have not asked to speak in order to explain my vote on the Soviet amendment, but I do wish to say that there is an immediate need for an institution of learning higher than the high school level where adults who cannot leave their families and go to Guam to study will have an opportunity to advance. They do have the desire to do this. That is the reason why I submitted my sub-amendment to the Soviet amendment.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With respect to the vote on paragraph 21, the Soviet delegation would like to request a separate vote on the first part of the third sentence, which reads as follows:

"While recognizing that the College of Guam and the East-West Centre in Hawaii provide fairly accessible institutions of higher education for Micronesian students, and while appreciating that a population of 38,000 would not usually require the establishment of a separate junior college,".

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, the Council will now vote on the first part of the third sentence of paragraph 21, as read out by him.

The first part of the sentence was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 21 as a whole was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will now consider the ninth Soviet amendment, which is to insert a new paragraph before existing paragraph 22. I should also like to remind members that the representative of New Zealand at one of our recent meetings orally submitted a sub-amendment to replace the words "to self-determination and independence" by the words "to self-determination, which includes independence".

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to ask the representative of New Zealand, through the President, why the Council does not have this sub-amendment in writing, even though a sufficient period of time for doing so has elapsed since its submission.

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): I feel that I must apologize for the fact that my delegation has not submitted this sub-amendment in writing. However, we feel that we did give very adequate notice of it by introducing it two days ago: it is included in the verbatim record of our debates and will have been available to delegations for at least the requisite period of time -- although not, I admit, formally submitted in writing.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): In the amendment now before us, we have references to certain principles and documents with which I would not quarrel. I do believe, however, that the point regarding self-determination and independence brought up the day before yesterday, I think, by the representative of New Zealand is well taken. Any act of self-determination may well result in independence: that is one of the self-determination choices open to the people involved. But such an act need not necessarily result in this or that political form. It is for the people to decide, through the exercise of the act itself.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Australian representative is once again trying to create the impression that attempts are made to foist upon the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands a particular form of government, that attempts are made to choose on their behalf what is best suited to them and what the result of the act of self-determination must be. If the representative of Australia will read the Soviet amendment more carefully, he will see that, far from containing any such attempts, the amendment merely reaffirms the right of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Charter and with the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

Moreover, I should like to remind the representative of Australia, who is also a member of the Australian delegation in the Special Committee of Twenty-Four, that this specific wording was used by the Special Committee of Twenty-Four in its conclusions and recommendations on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands when it considered this question at the end of 1964.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): My colleague from the Soviet Union persists in attributing some Machiavellian designs to me when I express an opinion. I was not trying to create any such impression as he indicates; I was simply expressing a point of view, and I suppose I am entitled to do that. It happened to accord with the point of view expressed by our colleague from New Zealand in this Council two days ago. That point of view remains that the wording of this paragraph, "self-determination and independence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and with the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples", is not in accord with my understanding of the self-determination provisions of the Charter and indeed of resolution 1514.

Nor do I see any reference in this amendment -- and I make this additional point -- to the Trusteeship Agreement, which my delegation believes is a valid document and a basic document in relation to all Trust Territories, and which, I would remind this Council, was acceded to not only by the other Members of the United Nations involved but by the Soviet Union itself.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should also like to remind the representative of Australia that he was not particularly worried by the United States' ignoring some of the provisions of the self-same Trusteeship Agreement which he has now spoken about at such length and which he has tried to defend against the evil Soviet Union. It will be recalled that, in the order of the Secretary of the Interior of the United States which set forth the powers of the Congress of Micronesia, one single word was omitted -- but a rather significant word -- which is present in the Trusteeship Agreement. That was the word "independence". At the time, the representative of Australia was not particularly worried by that fact. Furthermore, I should like to solve my own riddle and say that the absence of that word made him joyful rather than causing him any concern.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I can only repeat what I said before. I do not know what basis the representative of the Soviet Union has for his interpretation of my feelings of joy or sorrow. I expressed neither joy nor sorrow. If I remember rightly, I said nothing during that portion of the debate

(Mr. McCarthy, Australia)

and I gave no indications to our colleague from the Soviet Union that I was either joyful or sad. He spoke at great length on this, and I listened very attentively to everything he had to say. I must say that I do object to this psychanalysis of my feelings, without anything to back it up.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Even if we were to carry out some psychoanalysis of the representative of Australia -- which we do not intend to do -- I think our point of view would be affirmed: that the representative of Australia was completely indifferent to the absence of that word from the order in question, because he did not even insist on having the representative of the United States give any more or less sensible explanation for the omission of the word, which is more important than any other as far as the Trust Territory is concerned.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): This is a barren debate as far as I am concerned and as far as the advancement of the purposes of this Council is concerned. I did say that I would remind our colleague from the Soviet Union that a basis document in this respect is the Trusteeship Agreement -- and the word does occur in the Trusteeship Agreement, I believe. Whether the word does or does not appear in some other document put out by the Department of the Interior or any other Department of the United States Government is not, I think, relevant, because it does not alter the Trusteeship Agreement. My contention stands: that the basic document is the Trusteeship Agreement, which, I verily believe, does contain the word to which my colleague from the Soviet Union is referring.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In my capacity as President of the Council, I call upon the representative of the Republic of China.

Mr. KIANG (China): I think it would be better if my colleagues in the Council were to limit their interventions to the subject under consideration, that is to say, the amendment to the recommendation of the Drafting Committee. Having said that, I would comment very briefly on that amendment. I would be prepared to vote for it on certain conditions, and I will explain later why I lay down those conditions.

First, the words "and independence" should be deleted, for the simple reason that "self-determination" is a right and also a process. Independence is quite a different thing; self-determination is close to independence, self-government and other forms of independence.

May I draw the attention of the Council to the text of the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The Council will note that not one paragraph in that text ever mentions "self-determination and independence"; it mentions just the right of self-determination. The word "independence" is mentioned, but not together with the word "self-determination" -- and for obvious reasons which I do not have to go into.

In the second place, operative paragraph 2 of resolution 1514 (XV) states:

"All peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status" -- that means independence or self-government or even free association -- "and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development."

Since the amendment is based upon this particular resolution, I think that we must use the right terminology. Therefore, as I said, that is the first condition, and I will vote for it on that condition.

The second condition is that I will vote for the amendment if the words "Trusteeship Agreement" are also added to it; that is: "in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, with the Trusteeship Agreement and with the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples". If those conditions are not met, I will not be able to lend my support to this amendment.

Mr. FCTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The discussion in the Trusteeship Council on the question of the Pacific Islands and on the Trust Territories has already convinced the Soviet delegation that the Council has lagged far behind the United Nations as a whole in understanding the concepts by which the United Nations is guided in the solution of colonial problems; it is far out of step with the United Nations; it is separated by quite a considerable distance from other United Nations organs dealing with these questions.

However, we must not forget that there do exist United Nations organs which have already taken a position in this matter, and I should like to remind the members of the Council that when they adopt a position on the Soviet amendment, they are also taking a stand on a specific recommendation of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four. If they support the amendment, they will at the same time -- inasmuch as the text takes up the recommendation of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four -- support and show co-operation with the Special Committee of Twenty-Four. That would be genuine co-operation and not formal co-operation. If they vote against the amendment, they will thereby oppose the recommendation of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four, which has been empowered by the General Assembly to follow the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America): I regret that I have to delay the Council, but the Soviet representative reverted to something on which we have already spent four or five hours this session, or perhaps ten hours, and I feel that it requires me to speak once again.

The representative of the Soviet Union says that the United States delegation ignores the word "independence" in the charter of the Congress of Micronesia. It is quite true that the word "independence" does not appear in the charter of the Congress of Micronesia. However, as he well knows, and as the entire Council knows, and as I must restate here, my Government bases all of its action in the Trust Territory on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Trusteeship Agreement. In both of those, it is stated that the Administering Authority shall advance the people towards self-government or independence. I have repeated those words, I have repeated our support of them, every single time, and I would like to say again that that is the basis of our position, that that is the basis of our administration of the Territory: to promote the people towards self-government or independence.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am equally unwilling to take up the Council's time over a question which we discussed and in respect of which we have received, and understood, a clear-cut reply from the United States delegation. At this stage the Soviet delegation would like to say that what has been stated here by the United States

representative is for our consumption, so to speak, and the document which sets down the powers of the Congress of Micronesia is for consumption in Micronesia internally; as the Americans say, for home consumption. We know that the United States has an interest in keeping silent on the most important decisions of the United Nations and even distorts the Trusteeship Agreement. The Trusteeship Agreement clearly says that the United States bears responsibility for developing the Trust Territory towards self-government or independence. In the most important document relating to this document, and also in other documents, and in particular in the charter of the Mariana Islands, the word "independence" is absent.

When the United States representative is asked here to give an explanation for this, he cannot tell us anything that we can understand.

That is all I have to say, and once again I should like to apologize for the fact that my delegation had to ask for the floor at this stage on this particular topic.

Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom): I should like to state the view of my delegation very briefly on this amendment. My Government's views on the question of self-determination are well known by the fact that, contrary to other Governments and one in particular, it has applied and put into practice the principle of self-determination in the Territories under its administration. Therefore, our views correspond with the general principles envisaged by this amendment. However, in looking at the text of the amendment I cannot see, either in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) or in the Charter, the conjunction of wording which is used here. The words "self-determination and independence" do not, as far as I have been able to determine, appear in this conjunction in either of these documents. Therefore, it would be difficult for my delegation to support the amendment.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In various United Nations organs the representatives of the Administering Authorities, including the representative of the United Kingdom, like stubbornly to foist the thought that, allegedly, the United Kingdom, with honour and dignity, has led to independent statehood many Territories and peoples. When we hear such

statements, we involuntarily think of the dozens of colonial wars waged by the United Kingdom for possession of the colonial Territories; the sufferings of millions of people during the long years of British colonial domination; the pillaging of the colonies in the interest of the handful of exploiters in the metropolitan Territory; the facts of political, economic and social backwardness of the colonial peoples; the prisons and the torture chambers which the leaders and fighters for national liberation of those countries have had to face.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of Australia on a point of order.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Mr. President, we are dealing with the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; that being so, I fail to understand the relevance of the tirade that our colleague from the Soviet Union has embarked upon.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation does not expect the representative of Australia ever to understand what he has described as a "tirade" on the part of the Soviet delegation. But I think that his statement on a point of order is out of order. The representative of the United Kingdom made a general statement and the Soviet delegation deemed it necessary to reply to that statement.

In conclusion, the Soviet delegation would merely wish to state the following. The present good intentions of our British colleagues -- and not only the past intentions -- are demonstrated by the acts of repression against the people of Aden, against the people of Southern Rhodesia and other territories.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I think that we are straying somewhat from our subject. I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom): I understand that the representative of the Soviet Union has now ceased to discuss the question of Aden and therefore I hope that I shall not have to raise a point of order.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall now vote on the sub-amendment of the delegation of New Zealand.

The sub-amendment was adopted by 4 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall now vote on the amendment of the Soviet Union, as amended by the sub-amendment submitted by New Zealand, which has just been adopted.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): Mr. President, I would ask you to read out the amendment on which we are now voting.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Secretary of the Council will now read out the text on which we are going to vote.

Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council): The text reads as follows:

"The Council reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to self-determination, which includes independence, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and with the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (resolution 1514 (XV))."

Mr. KIANG (China): If my memory does not fail me, I think I heard the representative of New Zealand say that his amendment was: "the right of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to self-determination, covering independence". I do not know whether or not I am right.

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): Perhaps I could clarify the situation as regards the text of our sub-amendment by simply quoting from the verbatim record of 22 June, in which the leader of my delegation put forward the sub-amendment, which reads as follows:

"The Council reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to self-determination (which includes the right of independence) in accordance with the Charter".
(1261st meeting, pages 58-60)

Mr. KIANG (China): Shall we include those brackets?

Mr. McARTHUR (New Zealand): I certainly would not insist on including the brackets. My point was, at least as I thought I heard the Secretary read out, that the words "which includes the right of independence" should be included. I think those were left out in the version that the Secretary read out to us.

Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Council): The Secretariat received the exact wording yesterday from the representative of New Zealand, Ambassador Corner, and it was: "which includes independence" without the words "the right". The text with those words was apparently handed in after the Council had adjourned yesterday. At any rate, it is up to the members of the Council to decide whether they would like to have the word "right" included or not.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Actually, the Council has voted, I must emphasize, on the wording which was submitted to the Council Secretary by the head of the New Zealand delegation. That is the text which we read out and on which the Council has already voted.

We shall proceed to vote on the Soviet amendment, as sub-amended.

A vote was taken by roll call.

China, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: China, Liberia, New Zealand, United States of America, Australia.

Abstaining: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The amendment, as sub-amended, was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): So that no variants or interpretations of our position may be advanced later, the Soviet delegation would like to say that its position in this matter is explained in its earlier statements, which are to be found in the verbatim records of the Trusteeship Council, and also in the text of the amendments submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union for consideration by the Council, which text has been altered by the sub-amendment submitted by the New Zealand delegation.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall now proceed to paragraphs 22 and 23. First I should like to say that, as the Council will recall, the Soviet delegation submitted amendments to paragraphs 22 and 23, the last two paragraphs in the report. One would make an addition preceding paragraph 22, while the other would replace paragraph 23 with a new paragraph which appears in paragraph 10 of document T/L.1097/Rev.1.

Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): I wish to say in relation to those amendments that my delegation believes the Administering Authority is in fact steadily implementing measures in an ordered way towards the provisions and purposes referred to. The direct implication that it has not done so and is not doing so is one which we cannot accept in this amendment.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall now proceed to vote on these two amendments, paragraphs 9 and 10 of document T/L.1097/Rev.1.

The amendments were rejected by 5 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall now proceed to vote on paragraph 22 of the report of the Drafting Committee.

Paragraph 22 was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall now proceed to vote on paragraph 23 of the report.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I request, Sir, that you put to a separate vote the following part of paragraph 23:

(spoke in English) -- "and 1541 (XV)".

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In compliance with the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, we shall first vote on the words "and 1541 (XV)" appearing in paragraph 23.

The words "and 1541 (XV)" were adopted by 6 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall now vote on paragraph 23 as a whole.

Paragraph 23 was adopted by 5 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation, in explanation of its vote on paragraph 23 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, would like to state that its negative vote on this paragraph is equivalent to a refusal to make it possible for the Administering Authority to annex the Trust Territory, a possibility which is opened up to the Administering Authority by the mention of resolution 1541 (XV).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall now proceed to vote on paragraph 4 of the report of the Drafting Committee, which reads as follows:

"The Committee recommends to the Trusteeship Council that it adopt the revised working paper on conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/L.1089 and T/L.1089/Add.1) as the basic text for the chapter on conditions in that Territory to be included in the next report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council."

The recommendation contained in paragraph 4 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We have thus completed our consideration of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not wish to delay the Council in its work, but if I am not mistaken, it would be in accord with our tradition for us to vote on paragraph 5 of the report of the Drafting Committee, in which the Committee recommends that the Trusteeship Council adopt the conclusions and recommendations in its report. In any case, I would ask that paragraph 5 of the report be put to the vote.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In compliance with the request of the representative of the Soviet Union I shall put paragraph 5 of the report to the vote.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 5 was adopted by 5 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America): I should like to explain briefly the vote of the United States delegation on the conclusions and recommendations and on the report as a whole.

As I said, I believe, at yesterday's meeting when we began to discuss the report and the various amendments thereto, although my Government obviously had some reservations about some of the conclusions and recommendations in the draft report, we felt that, on the whole, the report was a balanced one and accurately reflected the views which had been presented by the great majority of this Council during our discussions.

It will have been noted that we abstained from voting on a great many of the provisions in the report, and on all of its paragraphs as a whole, and I want it known here, particularly to the Drafting Committee and to the other members of the Council, that many of the things on which we abstained from voting were considered by us to be of vital importance to the Territory. We support them; we think that they are good recommendations, and we appreciate the fact that, after such extensive work, they were drafted. An abstention in no way implies that my Government does not approve many of the things on which we abstained from voting. We did abstain, however, from voting on the report itself and on individual paragraphs because as a matter of principle we believe that, as Administering Authority, we should do so when the Council is considering our administration of the Territory.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The United States representative is quite right in saying that the Council probably observed that the United States delegation abstained from voting both on individual paragraphs in the report of the Drafting Committee and on the report as a whole. I should like to say, however, that at none of the sessions of the Council -- at least since the twenty-seventh session -- has the United States delegation given any explanations of a substantive nature of the reasons why it has abstained from voting on reports of the Drafting Committees.

Presumably, the members of the Trusteeship Council have also noticed that the United States delegation has voted against every Soviet amendment, but that, on the other hand, it adopted a positive position when any particular word of praise was expressed with regard to the situation in the Trust Territory or when the Council expressed its satisfaction or admiration concerning conditions there.

Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America): My delegation did not think that the Council would care to be treated to a two or three hours' summary of its views on each paragraph of the draft report. But I would refer the representative of the Soviet Union to the work which has been done in the last month. My delegation has expressed its view on every item contained in that report. We made our opinions clear on every subject. We made long statements; we answered questions. We replied interminably to the statements made by the Soviet delegation at various times, even when we were not discussing the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. I believe that the records, since 29 May, explain fully the position of my Government on everything contained in this report.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I believe that it will be necessary to hold two meetings of the Council tomorrow in order to make as much progress as possible in our consideration of the report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of New Guinea. Therefore, I would request representatives -- who have no doubt begun to read the Drafting Committee's report -- to be prepared to submit any possible amendments so that they may be considered as soon as possible. We shall also take up the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union (T/L.1095).

I believe that the report of the Drafting Committee contains certain errors, for example, in the numbering of the paragraphs. I refer particularly to the paragraph numbered 6 in the annex: this should be paragraph 1. I make this observation because some delegations may wish to submit amendments and I think that it would save time if the paragraphs could be referred to by number.

Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to have some clarification, Mr. President. Must those delegations which intend to submit amendments to the report follow the numbering in the document as it now stands, or should we follow the traditional numbering -- in other words a separate series of numbers for the annex to the report?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I think that it would be preferable to follow the traditional method of numbering; that is, the first paragraph of the annex would be number 1, although in the document now before me (T/L.1099) the paragraphs have been numbered in succession from the front page, so that the first paragraph of the annex appears as number 6.

The Council will hold two meetings tomorrow because it is essential to complete our work by Monday, 28 June, at the latest.

The meeting rost at 5.50 p.m.