



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



UN LIBRARY

JUN 4 1982

Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1530
27 May 1982

ENGLISH

Forty-ninth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 21 May 1982, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. POUDADE (France)

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 September 1981: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)

Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (continued)

Programme of work

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent, within one week of the date of this document, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

32-60576

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR
ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1981: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS
(T/1837; T/L.1228 and Add.1-3) (continued)

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS LISTED IN THE ANNEX TO THE AGENDA (T/1836/Add.1)
(continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall continue to
put questions to the representatives of the Administering Authority, but beforehand
I should like to state that I have received a corrigendum to add to the delegation
for the Kwajalein Atoll Corporation the name of Mr. George Allen. This correction
will appear in document T/PET.10/196/Corr.2. If there is no objection, that
document will be published.

Before I call on the representative of the Soviet Union again, I understand
that Mrs. McCoy, the High Commissioner, is ready to reply to questions asked this
morning. I now call upon her.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): The subject that I wish to address myself to is Ebeye and it is to be hoped that it will be in answer to some of the questions raised at this morning's meeting.

There is no question that the situation on Ebeye is less than satisfactory. It has been so for many years. I do wish, however, to call the Council's attention to several relevant factors which I hope will assist in understanding the situation better.

The Administering Authority is in the course of providing assistance for the rehabilitation of the island and, in addition, of several nearby islands in order to relieve the population pressures on Ebeye. We would, however, call the attention of the Council to one very significant factor. Of the 7,000 or so inhabitants of the island, only about 500 are employed at the missile range. Those 500 earn wages based on the United States minimum wage, about five times higher than the former Trust Territory wage.

The net result of this high pay is the tendency of the extended family to move into the home of an employed person, who can then, through traditional lines of responsibility, be expected to provide for the unemployed. I should add that there are persons attracted to Ebeye from all over the Trust Territory, including Kosrae and Ponape, because of the wage scale and in spite of the living conditions. In other words, many residents of Ebeye are there by choice.

A few years ago the Trust Territory Government attempted to provide a solution to the over-population problem by providing field trip ships and free transportation to anyone who wanted to return to his home island. Only a very few responded to the invitation, and because of the Administering Authority's responsibility to support the principle of freedom of migration and settlement for all Trust Territory citizens we had no means of requiring or forcing a reduction in the population level. In summary, the situation on the island is as much a result of traditional family customs as our inability to keep the infrastructure ahead of the continuing increase in population.

In addition, there is under way at this time in Ebeye a very full programme of rehabilitation of the island. Some \$6 million have been allocated for public works improvement, including water, power, roads and hospital work. This is being handled by the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands. They have already contracted with the well-known firm headed by Bill Tocas.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

That firm and the landowners of the Kwajalein Atoll Corporation (KAC) have met and they have discussed the priorities, the design and the scope of the projects. In addition, there are \$1.3 million already on hand for the waste water sewer project that is now under way. This is funded by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) of the United States with another \$700,000 potential funds. Out of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funds there are \$2.5 million for a container yard which will be adjacent to their new dock, and a proposal for a warehouse facility in order to keep some of the incoming supplies right there so that they can be handy and, one hopes, would reduce the cost of some of them.

There is a new proposal for a causeway between Ebeye and Gugeegue Island. I repeat, however, that through the Government of the Republic of the Marshalls we are working on a complete programme of rehabilitation of the area and look forward to substantial progress in the future.

As to the hospital facilities, the decision is up to the Government of the Marshall Island health services and/or the Chief Administrator of the hospital on Ebeye. The criteria is whether the case in question is beyond their ability to handle, in other words, serious or an emergency. They are then referred to the Kwajalein hospital, which will take anyone that the Government asks it to within the limits of its capacity. Between Kwajalein hospital and the Marshalls health offices on Ebeye, co-operation is exceptionally good.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States): I should simply like to say that the High Commissioner, Mr. DeBrum and Mr. Teare also have some comments on the political education process that was mentioned by the Focus group this morning, if that would be permissible at this time.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I think we should first of all ask those delegations who put questions about Ebeye and Kwajalein if they have further questions to put to Mrs. McCoy and then, if the Council agrees, we shall call on the Special Representative to deal with the question of political education.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): We have no further questions on Kwajalein at this stage of the debate.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, I should like to ask a technical question. Is it intended that the reply of the High Commissioner, Mrs. McCoy, and the supplementary statement of Ambassador Sherman exhausts their possibilities of answering the question that was raised at this morning's meeting with respect to Ebeye and, in general, the question of the Kwajalein and the positioning on its territory of military installations of the United States? If this is the case, and this was a full reply, then in this connexion we are ready to put another question.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall reply to the question of the Soviet Union. This morning a series of questions were addressed in connexion with Ebeye and Kwajalein about the base, the hospital and the situation of the population on Ebeye. A reply was given by Mrs. McCoy and one by Mr. Sherman. So I will now turn to delegations which asked those questions and ask if they have further questions to put and do they think the replies were adequate. At a certain stage we will have the second part of the replies to be put by the heads of the delegation in connexion with the programme of political education, which Mr. DeBrum, Mr. Takesy and Mr. Ucherbelau will also be referring to. But for the time being, we are still dealing with Kwajalein and Ebeye.

Is this clarification satisfactory?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It is my understanding that we may now put additional questions to the Administering Authority with respect to Kwajalein and Ebeye, as well as, more generally, with respect to the situation in the parts of the Territory of Micronesia where the Administering Authority maintains military installations.

As we know, the Trusteeship Agreement states that the Administering Authority shall promote the economic advancement and self-sufficiency of the inhabitants, that it shall regulate the use of natural resources and encourage the development of fisheries, agriculture, industries; protect - and I particularly wish to emphasize this part of the Agreement - protect the inhabitants against the loss of their lands and resources, and improve the means of transportation and communication. Those are some of the obligations of the Administering Authority.

In that connexion, my delegation wishes to ask how far this obligation of the Administering Authority is being met with respect to the situation that has emerged on Kwajalein Island. As we have heard today in petitioners' statements, the people of Micronesia are being deprived of the right to utilize their own land. They are being deprived of the right to support their own existence in the region. They have been removed from Kwajalein Island and transferred to Ebeye Island, which is in fact quite unsuitable for supporting life or the development of the traditional crafts necessary for economic viability. I would therefore like some clarification about how far these obligations are being taken into account by the Administering Authority at the present time, as well as about the documents that the Administering Authority has prepared and is going to discuss with the Micronesian people in the future.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of the Administering Authority may reply, if he wishes, to the additional questions on Ebeye and Kwajalein Islands. We shall then move on the questions regarding the programme of political education.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I have some difficulty in understanding precisely what it is that my colleague, the representative of the Soviet Union, is asking. I should be most happy to attempt to provide a response to a specific question in writing, and I would also reserve the right to address this question of Ebeye and the hospital and land facilities there in more detail at a later stage.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

However, I think that the High Commissioner's response fully set forth the reasons for the situation that exists on Ebeye and the measures, financial and otherwise, that are being taken to remedy it, as well as the alternatives that are being developed.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I understand that the representative of the Administering Authority is proposing that the Soviet delegation put a question in writing that will then be replied to in detail.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): This appears to me to be a new form of reply to a question.

I think that if the representative of the Administering Authority did not understand my delegation's question, he might be enlightened by the statement made today by the representatives of the Micronesian people of Kwajalein; he might also be enlightened by drawing a comparison between the obligations of the Administering Authority as set forth in the Trusteeship Agreement and the actual situation in Kwajalein and Ebeye.

The question asked by the Soviet delegation was: how can we reconcile the obligations of the Administering Authority as set forth in the Trusteeship Agreement with the situation that exists in Kwajalein Island? What relationship is there between the two? This morning, the representative of the Administering Authority was asked a number of questions and was also asked to comment on the situation on Kwajalein in the light of the statements of the petitioners and speak in answer to what they had said. If what we have heard from him today constitutes an answer, that is further confirmation that in its activities in the Trust Territory the Administering Authority has been guided, is guided, and intends to continue being guided, not by the interests of the peoples of the Trust Territory, but instead by its own military and strategic interests.

Mrs. McCoy, when speaking today of the situation on Ebeye Island, mentioned the principle of freedom of choice of residence, a principal which the United States, as the Administering Power had always promoted and could not violate. But what about the situation on Kwajalein? What becomes of that principle there?

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Why are these principles not being applied in the case of the population of that island? Why are those people simply removed from the island? Why can they not support themselves? Why do they have insufficient means to maintain the standard of living they enjoyed when they were living on Kwajalein? That is what our question was about. If the representative of the United States wishes to receive it in writing, he can have it as soon as the written records of today's meetings are available.

I wish incidentally to draw attention to one not quite satisfactory aspect of the work of the Department of Public Information, whose responsibility it is to issue press releases during the discussions in the Trusteeship Council. The press releases are full of distortions and reflect the imagination of their authors.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of the Soviet Union has pointed out that some of the press releases have been unsatisfactory. As he knows, delegations can submit corrections to Mr. Akashi's office in the Department of Public Information. This is not a new state of affairs. Delegations often complain about the press releases. The Soviet delegation can contact the appropriate section in the Department of Public Information or, if it prefers, this can be done through the Trusteeship Council President or its secretariat.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States): I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for his clarification. However, he continues to refer to charges made by petitioners this morning as facts. I would not quarrel with the right of any individual to express his opinion, but I should like to stress that petitioners appearing before this Council are appearing in their own right and not as representatives of the Micronesian Government or the Micronesian people. The Marshall Islands Government represents the people of Kwajalein, and we have continued to work, as we should work, through the Government of the Marshall Islands to meet the needs of the people of Kwajalein.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

I believe that Mrs. McCoy's statement addressed the questions raised with respect to the situation in Kwajalein, what it is, what its dynamics are, and, as I said in my immediately preceding statement, the various ways in which we have attempted to meet what is admittedly a difficult situation that has broad cultural dimensions and dimensions specifically related to the employment situation of the people resident on Ebeye.

I do not believe, and I would certainly reject any assertion, that the United States, in its stewardship under the Trusteeship Agreement, has in any way had any other motive than to serve the needs of the Micronesian people. Economic development, while it may not be all that we would have hoped, has none the less materially, indeed vastly, increased compared to what it was 30 years ago.

I would revert to statements I made yesterday about military bases and our right to maintain the one that we maintain under the Trusteeship Agreement and the fact that we do not at present have any intention of expanding military presence in the Territory. That does not in any way derogate from our right to do so under the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement.

I think we have now responded fully to the questions raised by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The last statement made by the representative of the United States led us to the question that we asked at the beginning about the relationship between the rights of the United States as set out in the Trusteeship Agreement and the obligations of the United States as regards the Micronesian population. That was our initial question, and that is what concerns us, for that relationship is seemingly not in favour of the interests of the Micronesian people.

The United States refers to its right to establish bases on Micronesian territory, but I am referring to the Trusteeship Agreement itself, which states that the United States as Administering Authority must protect the population from the loss of land and natural resources. In this relationship

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

between the rights and the obligations of the Administering Authority the obligations of the United States to the people of Micronesia are of primary importance. That is what should have priority among the activities of the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory.

Yesterday Ambassador Sherman stated that the United States, as Administering Authority, is acting in the Trust Territory in accordance with the interests of the Micronesian people and the interests of the United States of America, and does not intend to make use of any specific "recipes". However, the "recipe" which was referred to by Ambassador Sherman is nothing less than the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. That is not the recipe of any one delegation seated here in the Trusteeship Council. It is a document of the United Nations, a document with which all nations are familiar, a document supported by the entire progressive world. It is a document in accordance with which a great number of Territories once under colonial rule have received their independence.

At this morning's meeting, Mr. President, you said that there were other matters to be dealt with. We shall be ready to put further questions to the representatives of the Administering Authority after that has been done.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Before calling on the representatives of the Administering Authority and France I wish to inform the Council that two petitioners, Mr. Ataji Balos and Mr. Allen from the Kwajalein Atoll Corporation, have each asked to make a brief comment. This morning we finished our hearing of the petitioners, but of course, if the members of the Council agree I suggest that we might hear any comments they wish to make. Is there any objection?

As I hear none I call on Mr. Balos.

Mr. BALOS: I should like to call on our legal counsel, Mr. George Allen, to comment on statements made by the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory earlier.

Mr. ALLEN: Please allow me to identify myself. My name is George M. Allen. I am an American lawyer and I practise law in the Marshall Islands and in Honolulu, Hawaii. I have since 1975 acted as legal counsel for the landowners of Kwajalein Atoll.

First I should say, on behalf of my clients, the landowners of Kwajalein Atoll, that no disrespect is meant towards the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory, Mrs. McCoy. We fully appreciate that she is new to the position of High Commissioner and is new to involvement in the affairs of the Marshall Islands and of Micronesia and we understand completely that she has not yet had a full opportunity personally to acquaint herself with the situation at Kwajalein Atoll in depth.

We do think, in light of the statements which have been made by representatives of the Administering Authority with regard to Kwajalein, that a few very brief comments are in order. First of all, we should say that the situation at Kwajalein, that is the social and economic circumstances of the people of Kwajalein - and I say people in a broad sense, not only that more than 5,000 landowners of Kwajalein who live on Kwajalein Atoll, but also the approximately 3,000 other Micronesian persons, most but not all of whom are Marshallese - have been quite stable for at least the entire time of my involvement since 1975. That is, the over-all population has been about the same, the number of jobs has been about the same, the social and economic circumstances are very little different now from those which obtained six or

(Mr. Allen)

seven years ago. The \$6.5 million in capital improvements to which reference has been made represents money referred to in budgeting documents of the Trust Territory as early as ten years ago, most of which was submitted in documentation executed in Washington, D.C. on 27 September 1979. We should be remiss if we did not put the record right in stating that the delay in committing that money and spending it has been very great indeed. I think we should also point out the relative inadequacy of that level of budgeting or funding to the very great need of the affected population. Just by way of example, electric-power generating alone on Majuro Atoll, where the population is significantly greater, is budgeted at a level of well over \$20 million and when one contemplates a population of the size of the indigenous population of Kwajalein, which as I say has been quite stable for many years, the scale of appropriate level of expenditure can be seen to be truly much much greater than the level to which reference has been made.

Statements have been made here - and we have heard them on many other occasions - about Kwajalein's social and economic problems being a product of people having moved in from elsewhere. There are about 550 jobs at the Kwajalein missile range paid at United States wage rates. In addition there are between 150 and 200 jobs, depending on the time of year, for indigenous persons, mostly women, to work as domestic servants for American personnel on the military base. There are in addition to those jobs approximately another 400 full-time cash jobs in the local economy at Kwajalein. Thus the total number of jobs or persons employed in the cash economy is on an order of 1,000 to 1,100 people. The total population ranges from about 7,500 to 8,000, depending on whether students are home from school or are away.

Thus I think the Council can see rather easily that the ratio of people in the entire population to the work-force, that is the entire work-force of people in the wage economy, is about six to one. That is far and away the lowest ratio in the entire area. It is a much lower ratio than Majuro or Kolonia, Ponape or Honiara, in the Solomon Islands or Tarawa in Kiribati. The impression that Kwajalein is a product of large, extended families dependent on a few cash jobs is one that is given widely but which in our judgement does not withstand close scrutiny.

(Mr. Allen)

I think that perhaps the relative newness of many of the people now responsible for speaking on behalf of the Administering Authority makes it difficult for them to understand fully the import of some of the things that are being contemplated. For example, we have heard today - and we welcome the news - of a causeway from Ebeye Island to Gugeegue Island, but we would point out that Gugeegue was used in the missile-testing operations for a period of many years terminating in 1975 without any compensation to the landowners of Gugeegue and documentation has never been executed for its return to them so that they can undertake development of it. Without that documentation, of course, it is virtually impossible for them to go ahead with any kind of projects. Up until now - and we do not know if we now have a new situation - all attempts to return to Gugeegue have been based on a precondition that the landowners should waive or give up any claim they might have to compensation for the past military use of Gugeegue.

(Mr. Allen)

I and my clients believe it is very important that we be absolutely factually accurate in the statements we make with respect to the conditions which exist at Kwajalein Atoll. In view of the limited time available, therefore, we hope that there may be an opportunity to supplement the record of the Trusteeship Council proceedings when all questions are in and the provisional verbatim record is available, which we would ask that we be permitted to do in writing, before consideration by the Trusteeship Council and then by the Security Council. We would certainly welcome any comments which might be made by the Administering Authority on any such submissions.

In conclusion we would state on behalf of the landowners of Kwajalein Atoll that we stand completely by the statements made on behalf of the petitioners by Chairman Balos and President Imada Kabua. We believe that they are factual and accurate and that they will withstand the closest scrutiny by the Trusteeship Council.

I thank you, Mr. President, for giving me the opportunity to make a statement on behalf of my clients.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): That concludes the special hearing of petitioners and they may now withdraw.

The petitioners withdrew.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We return now to questions to the Administering Authority. The representative of the Soviet Union asked a certain number of questions. Does the Administering Authority wish to reply?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Before replies are given I should like to comment that although my delegation did not object to the recent special hearing of petitioners I find it an irregular procedure for petitioners, as distinct from members of delegations, to engage in comment on and/or rebuttal of statements made in the course of the proceedings of the Council. It seems to me that it is incumbent upon petitioners to organize their presentations in such a way as to make their full

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

presentation. Subsequently, following the publication of the record of the proceedings, they can add comments, but I do not think it appropriate or helpful to the work of the Council for them to be engaged in item-by-item or minute-by-minute comment on statements made here by members of delegations.

I now turn to Mrs. McCoy, Mr. Teare and Mr. DeBrum to make comments regarding the political education process.

Mrs. McCoy (Special Representative): On the political education aspect, the Administering Authority has sponsored the translation of the Compact of Free Association into 12 Micronesian languages, pending the completion of negotiations on various subsidiary agreements; the balance will be translated also. Those translations, along with the English version, will then form one of the important parts of the political education programme. The Administering Authority is, as we stated in our opening remarks, fully supportive of a thorough and impartial political education campaign. We wish to assure this Council that when the negotiations are completed we will co-operate in and support such a programme, which encompasses not only the concept of free association but its alternatives as well.

The Administering Authority looks forward to full co-operation with the Micronesian Governments concerned in jointly planning and carrying out the programme leading to the plebiscite, which will be observed by the international community. The English translation of the Compact has been available in the Trust Territory Government headquarters in Saipan ever since it was finished and finally initialled by all the parties concerned, and then it was withheld by the Reagan Administration until it had had time to go over it. We now have it complete, and it has always been ready for anyone who wished to ask for it.

Mr. DeBRUM (Special Representative): This morning, when some of the petitioners referred to a political education programme, specific mention was made of the Marshall Islands, to the effect that the Governor of the Marshall Islands did not consider it important to have a political education programme. I wish the record to reflect that that is really not the case. The people of the Marshall Islands are 99.9 per cent literate. They are most concerned about happenings in government and in the economy which affect their lives. There are only 32,000 or 33,000 people living on the Marshalls and, with a small population, decisions of the Government which in other countries might not be as important to the lives of the people in outlying areas are important in the Marshall Islands.

If we take the Parliament of the Marshall Islands, its 33 Members, and figure out the proportionate number of constituents per Member of Parliament, we find that for every member there are on average fewer than 1,000 constituents. As a matter of fact, some communities which send one Member of Parliament to Majuro, to the Nitijela, have fewer than 20 registered voters. In the case of Majuro and Kwajalein, where there is a smaller number of Members of Parliament in relation to the population, people have more access to documents, radio and newspapers than in other areas.

In addition, every atoll of the Marshalls has a municipal council, the membership of which ranges from 10 to as many as 35. Those leaders concern themselves with much of what is going on now and also what has happened in the years since the trusteeship started. Furthermore, we have organizations such as the Kwajalein Atoll Corporation which, as the Council will have seen, are very much concerned over the issues that are dealt with in our negotiations with the United States relating to termination of the trusteeship. We have other planning councils, such as the Bikini Council and the Enewetak Council.

We have 82 schools scattered throughout the Marshalls, with teachers who are also very much concerned about political education and who have no reservations about sharing their views with people in the villages and the communities in which they work.

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Representative)

In addition, we have health aides and we have religious leaders who take part in these discussions. We have the Maryknoll Sisters, such as those who were present here this morning, to question political education in the Marshalls. They are out in the villages of the Marshall Islands, teaching. The idea that a political education programme must be concerned only with the Compact of Free Association is troublesome to us. We have always considered our relationship with the United States through the Trusteeship Agreement to be one that fosters political education not only on the specific document on free association but also on all alternatives.

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Representative)

Indeed, our education system is geared towards educating our people in those various choices.

Further, we find it troublesome that organizations concerned with political education seem to labour under the illusion that our country must have a political education programme in which every man in the village street must understand the Compact. I have yet to find a single taxi driver in New York who knows about the Compact of Free Association. We have a political leadership that is versed in the issues of termination, in the issues of independence, in the issues of free association and other choices of political status. For visitors from the outside to measure the level of political education in the Marshalls by casual contacts with our people who do not always know all the different intricacies of the Compact of Free Association is not a fair gauge of political awareness.

One of the petitioners this morning mentioned the practice of town hall meetings which we have in the Marshalls. Many members of this Trusteeship Council and members of the Secretariat who have visited the islands over the years have been witness to this wonderful phenomenon of democratic practice. We continue to foster and encourage such meetings and we shall consider those meetings to be an integral part of our education programme which begins on 1 June.

It may interest the Council to know that in our delegation meeting at lunch today we also discussed the possibility of translating the verbatim records of this Trusteeship Council session, as well as portions of the last one, for distribution amongst our people as additional assistance in understanding what is happening here.

Mr. UHERBELAU (Special Representative): Yesterday and today, during this question and answer session, political education has come up in one form or another. The Republic of Palau initialled the Compact of Free Association on 17 December 1980. In December 1980 there was a conference held at headquarters in Saipan, purportedly on a plebiscite date. Representatives of the Marshalls and Palau took part in this conference.

(Mr. Uherbelau, Special Representative)

The Federated States of Micronesia did not take part. At that conference in December 1980 we were given a proposed Secretarial Order to establish an office of Plebiscite Commissioner, very much modelled after the one for the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas. We rejected that avenue of political education and informed the Administering Authority about our objection because if we had followed it, a subsequent Secretarial Order would have been a document to which the already approved constitutions would be subservient.

In March 1981 another conference was held in Saipan attended by all the translators from the Marshalls, the Federated States of Micronesia and Palau. In that conference we were given to understand that \$750,000 had been allocated by the Administering Authority to fund a political education programme. We returned to our respective areas with copies of the Compact of Free Association in English, and in Palau we distributed these copies to schools, religious organizations, State Governments, where we could spare them. It has been reported that the Compact of Free Association has been translated into 12 languages. In Palau it has been translated into three languages. The translation was sent to the headquarters for reproduction in August 1981. Just last month we were given permission to have the copies reproduced.

Another reference has been made with respect to political education, as to whether or not the people are being educated both on the Compact of Free Association and on independence. As one who has been closely involved with the status negotiations on the side of the Republic of Palau, I cannot and have not been able fully to understand the Compact itself. If we are to conduct a political education programme both on the Compact of Free Association and on independence as a choice, I think we are going to confuse our own people. I should not like to give the impression that the Administering Authority in the area of political education is itself to blame, and not us. I think it is incumbent upon us, the people of Palau, to take this political education seriously and to use whatever means are at our disposal to get our people educated.

(Mr. Uherbelau, Special Representative)

Having been involved in negotiations, I have been interviewed on the air four or five times during that period. We have broadcasting stations, and we have broadcast sessions of our legislature as well as cabinet meetings of the President's office.

I would join with my colleague from the Marshalls in saying that people from outside cannot gauge what we have been doing in educating our people and should not try to impose their own standards of political education on what we are doing to inform our people about the future.

Mr. TAKASY (Special Representative): The position of the Federated States of Micronesia on political education is that it is vital to self-government in our nation. We view an informed choice as a very critical one in the nation and so we have carefully worked out a programme that we have submitted to the Administering Authority for consideration and for funding.

(Mr. Takasy, Special Representative)

We view the Administration Authority as responsible for providing political education in Micronesia. We have begun the process of political education by asking our various States to submit what they view as the parameters of a political education that would be appropriate for the people of the Federated States.

At the national level we have prepared a proposal and transmitted it officially to the High Commissioner. As Mrs. McCoy has pointed out, we have finished the translation of the Compact itself. Because the subsidiary agreements are not yet completed, it is of course impossible to predict how soon we can complete the translation process, but I can assure this Council that my Government will do everything possible to ensure that a fair and soundly based political education process takes place throughout the nation. We hope that the Administering Authority will view our request for funding and a time schedule seriously and sympathetically so that we can get the necessary personnel and financial assistance to carry out the programme as we envisage it.

Mr. TEARE (Special Representative): I would simply try to recapitulate what has been said on the subject by several members of our delegation not only this afternoon, but earlier this week. I think that the statements the Council has just heard from the three Special Representatives already indicate that there is a diversity of approach and yet a common commitment on the part of all three to get the task of providing information on the public plebiscite under way.

To recapitulate, first the United States is fully cognizant of the need for a comprehensive and objective information programme to precede the plebiscite, and is prepared also to contribute to the material support of that programme.

Secondly, the moment for the formal commencement of that programme has not yet arrived because we are dealing with a Compact of Free Association that has so far been initialled but not yet signed and with subsidiary agreements, most of which are still under negotiation. When the negotiations are complete and the documents are signed, the formal information programme can and will begin.

(Mr. Teare, Special Representative)

The Compact as initialled in 1980 has, as the Council has heard, been translated into 12 Micronesian languages. Since there may be at least minor amendments to the Compact, prudence dictates that we commence printing of the Compact in quantity, that is, in English and in its various translations, only when the document is in absolutely final form. The subsidiary agreements obviously cannot be translated until they are complete.

Finally, as an indication also of the sensitivity of the Administering Authority to the wishes of the individual Micronesian Governments, I would point out that the draft secretarial order of late 1980 or early 1981 to which Mr. Uherbelau referred has been withdrawn and will never again see the light of day. After reconsideration and taking into account the observations of the Palauan and Marshallese representatives at the Conference to which Mr. Uherbelau referred, we concluded that it would indeed be consistent with the level of self-government already established in the Trust Territory for the constitutional Governments of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia to bear the main responsibility for the design and implementation of the information programme in their respective jurisdictions.

I would recall once again that the United States, in October 1981, invited each of those three delegations to the negotiating round in Hawaii to begin preparing its plan and to consult with the United States about the plan at an early date.

It is correct, as Mr. Takesy says, that the plan elaborated by the Federated States of Micronesia has been submitted to the High Commissioner. We were pleased to hear Mr. DeBrum's statement earlier this week that his Government is now prepared to discuss its plan with the United States. We hope that the Government of Palau will similarly formulate its plan in somewhat more detail than has been the case to date and we look forward to discussing Palau's plan with the appropriate officials of its Government in the near future. That, I think, is a capsule picture of the plebiscite information programme preparations as they stand at this moment.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): I have just a very brief comment. Recently, in commenting on the reply of the Administering Authority to the question put this morning on the Kwajalein Atoll and the fate

(Mr. Barelli, France)

of the inhabitants, I said that I had no additional questions to put at this stage. That does not imply, of course, that I am fully satisfied with the reply or that I have no further questions to put at a later stage. It is simply that this question is important and complex. I am not familiar with this problem and I prefer to wait until I have the record of the reply, which I can compare with my own questions and the statements made by petitioners which were heard this morning, and then, with your agreement, Mr. President, I will ask additional questions.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have listened most attentively to the statements made by the Special Representatives on the delegation of the Administering Authority and the representatives of Micronesia, and to the statements made by the representative of the United States itself with respect to the problem of political education in the Territory. We have seen, in fact, that there are various approaches. One aspect which we wish to emphasize relates to the statement of the representative from Palau about political education and the understanding of the Palauan people of the process that is taking place.

An essential point is where the political education commences, and initially, when our delegation, together with other delegations, raised the question of political education of the population in the Trust Territory, we were addressing the question to the Administering Authority, and from what we have heard today it appears that the process of political education as viewed by the Administering Authority would begin from the time when the Compact of Free Association has been finalized.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Is that, in fact, the starting point in the political education process, the threshold at which political education begins? Such is hardly the case, for if a people is to be educated politically after it has received a document and after that document has been explained to them, their education will be limited to that document. Furthermore, from what we have been told by the Administering Authority, if the people who are being educated politically reject the document that is supposed to form the basis of their political education, the Administering Authority will then consider other alternatives. Is that supposed to be political education? We find it difficult to agree with such a concept. If we are going to have political education, we must offer the people the opportunity of understanding the alternatives available to them, in the first instance, and we must also make it clear that the document that has been drawn up and presented to them is only one of those alternatives. That would be the correct and just approach to this question of political education. The Administering Authority, however, says that when the document or documents have been completed and when the translation has been amended, it will then be time to begin the process of political education. Can that be right?

From this viewpoint, the representative of Palau was certainly correct when he stated that people from elsewhere would find it difficult to understand this approach to the political education of our people, and that seems to be a very fair comment addressed to the Administering Authority, which came to the Territory from outside.

A second comment I should like to make is concerned not only with today, but also with previous meetings of the Council, and it applies to one of the first questions put to the Administering Authority with regard to its own view of its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement. In Mrs. McCoy's statement we detected the implication that the Administering Authority regards its present obligation to be to assist the constitutional Governments that have been created in the Territory, which are mainly concerned with day-to-day administrative affairs, and also to exercise general supervision over situation and developments in the Territory. I am not drawing attention to this idly, because our

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

discussion is now approaching the substance of the report submitted by the Administering Authority to the Trusteeship Council this year, and that report reflects a similar approach. We understand that the Territory is undergoing internal political development and that its people are striving towards self-determination and developing their own administrative cadres and machinery. Does that mean, however, that the responsibility or delegation, of the Administering Authority with regard to the Trust Territory are therefore reduced?

I do not recall to which special representative of the Administering Authority was addressed the question concerning the present budgetary funds for the Trust Territory and the allocation of those funds, and how they are being used for the Territory's development. I would not say that the reply was totally offhand, but it was very close to being so. It was made in a way that implied that the United States has provided such and such a sum and that, beyond that, the money can now be allocated by the Governments of the Trust Territory. Such, indeed, is the case. But does that reduce the responsibility of the United States, as the Administering Authority, for the development of the Territory's economy, for the development of other sectors of the life of the Trust Territory? Does that reduce its responsibility under the Trusteeship Agreement? By no means.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

To make myself perfectly clear, I would say that until the trusteeship ends - to that very day, that very hour, that very minute - the Administering Authority bears full responsibility for the state of the economic development of the Territory. They bear full responsibility for everything that takes place in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

We have heard very often in the replies of the Administering Authority such statements as, "The representative of the Republic of Palau will reply to this question", or "The representative of the Marshall Islands will reply to that question". In that way it is virtually transferring its responsibility on to the shoulders of the representatives of the Micronesian people. Can that kind of approach be fully justified? True, these people are the real representatives of the Micronesian people; they know what is happening and how it is happening; they know the facts; they know the condition of the people in the Territory. However, the responsibility for this should not at this time be placed directly upon them: the responsibility lies with the Administering Authority.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I have listened with attention to the lengthy statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, which contained - if I was able to sort out the questions from the lecture - two basic questions. I would say that the whole tenor of the Soviet representative's remarks demonstrates the profound philosophical differences between his idea of what constitutes democratic procedure and political development and mine, that of the Administering Authority.

He asks when the political education process commences. I would say that the political education process commenced when we assumed our responsibilities as Administering Authority under the Trusteeship Agreement. The process has been and is a continuous one.

As has been underlined in the remarks made by the Special Representatives of the Micronesian entities, particularly Mr. DeBrum, the concepts of freedom of information, freedom of access to governmental representatives and freedom of discussion all exist in full measure in Micronesia and have contributed vastly over the years - not just since we assumed our responsibilities, but even before

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

in Micronesian culture - to a full understanding of just how important the individual is in the processes of society. The Administering Authority does not propose to instruct the people of the Micronesian Territory as to how they should vote or how they should think or how they should respond to any given process. What we intend to do and what we have tried to do, through programmes and through the encouragement of customs and traditions that already exist, has been to ensure that the people are fully informed of the issues, fully informed of what they are deciding and, even before that, fully involved in conducting their own affairs in every way possible.

Through the years there have been many Visiting Missions to observe past plebiscites and votes in the Trust Territory and all those Missions have reported to this Council that they found the people well-informed about their status alternatives. The constitutional referendums in each of the districts were observed by representatives of this Council. That is part and parcel of the political education process. Unfortunately, the USSR has chosen not to join these plebiscite missions; had it done so, perhaps its representative would have seen with his own eyes how well-informed and well-educated the people were.

It would be ludicrous to try to educate people about the terms of an agreement which has not yet been concluded and which in fact is still under negotiation. Their leaders who are engaging in these negotiations report back the issues involved, but until that document is complete, translated and made available no one can be expected to decide precisely how he will vote or to make a precise personal decision with respect to the process. It is important to remember that the negotiations are based on the principles that were agreed at Hilo. That is the concept: we are negotiating with each other on a Government-to-Government basis. That itself is significant, in that the Micronesian political entities have been negotiating and will continue to negotiate on that basis, as an equal partner, on their freely chosen future. It seems to me that this is ample evidence of the degree to which political education is carried on in the Territory.

Secondly, my colleague has asked, on the basis of things that have been said by various members of my delegation, whether the United States considers that its role or its obligation as Administering Authority has been in any way reduced,

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

degraded or eliminated because of the development of internal political institutions or the development of self-government. No, our ultimate authority is not in any way degraded. We are fully cognizant of our authority under the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement, but, contrary to practices in some other States, we make every effort to ensure that the peoples of Micronesia are aware at an early stage of their responsibility to live within their means, to manage their resources. Just as a parent enables his child, through the provision of allowances, to manage money, so must Governments learn to manage money through the allocation of specific budget limitations and encouragement to use the mechanics of the budget process to establish priorities and decide what can be done within the limits of the resources available and expected to be available.

I do not believe that that requirement of living within means is in any way an effort on the part of the Administering Authority to slough off its responsibility towards the peoples of Micronesia or towards their economic development. On the contrary, it is part of the process of helping them to attain economic development in a more responsible and a more logical way.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): I will simply make a few comments about political education. The ultimate goal, of course, is to bring the people under trusteeship to a point where they can take care of their own affairs and meet mutually agreed upon international and regional standards of self-sufficiency and have the ability and will to choose among various alternatives. I would recall to the Council the five-year Programme of Education for Self-Government, which was known in the Council as ESG. That was started in 1974 at headquarters and then went out to the districts, as the local Government areas were then called. The programme was very meticulously handled by both headquarters and, as regards training, by the districts themselves. Among the subject areas in that five-year programme was status, and there was a thorough education in the various alternatives: free association, independence, commonwealth status or the status quo. There was also training in the democratic process. All of this has been going on for many years, both formally and informally and the local Governments inherited many of the people that worked in that programme, who are now involved in their own local Government programme.

This is a continuing process under the new Governments, a continuing form of education, so that their people will recognize the different kinds of government that are available to them. The presence of so many outspoken Micronesians in this chamber is ample evidence of the success of the process so far. Certainly we have had an outstanding group. So once again I can only say that as the occasion arises a specific programme will be launched for the plebiscite and that I sincerely anticipate that it will be the product of an agreement between the Administering Authority and the constitutional Governments.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We are satisfied with the reply just given us by the United States representative that the United States, as the Administering Authority, is not forgetting its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement. This question was not raised by us in order to deliver a lecture or a sermon or to teach things to the Administering Authority's representatives. We raised it in connexion with the statement by the representative of the Micronesian

people, Mr. Oiterong, a Special Representative with the United States at this session of the Trusteeship Council. I do not know whether it is necessary to refer to certain parts of Mr. Oiterong's statement, but probably this ought to be done if only to refresh the memory of the representative of the United States. Mr. Oiterong said:

(spoke in English)

"The Republic of Palau is neither a territory nor an insular possession of the United States and should not be subjected to changing fiscal policies of the United States Federal Government. We feel that the Republic of Palau has unique, if not basic, developmental needs and circumstances. The United States had assumed an international Trust obligation that should not be waived because of its domestic considerations. The Administering Authority initially targeted fiscal year 1981 as the date the Trusteeship Agreement for Micronesia, including Palau, would come to an end and the Compact of Free Association would begin. While this target was not met, the United States, as the Administering Authority, implemented its plan by not providing funds for capital improvement projects outside what was promised under the Compact of Free Association. The upshot of this was that Palau has not received capital improvement funds from fiscal year 1981 to date, except for a few exceptional cases." (T/PV.1524, p.12)

(continued in Russian)

It was precisely this that lay behind our question to the representative of the United States, the Administering Authority. Other statements were made by the representatives of the Micronesian people, and I have another question which I should like to put to the representatives of the Administering Authority, but first I will put an initial question to Mr. Gibbons, who also addressed the Council. May I do that now?

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If I understand correctly, the representative of the Soviet Union would like to reopen the hearing of petitioners. Is that correct?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not propose the reopening of the hearing of petitioners; I want to know if I can put a question and get an answer.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I am told that Mr. Gibbons has already left New York, but if the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to ask him a question I am sure he could do so in writing and Mr. Gibbons could doubtless let him have an answer in the same way. Or the representative of the Soviet Union could put the question to the Administering Authority and the Authority could transmit the question to Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am very sorry that Mr. Gibbons has left New York. That being the case, I shall put the question directly to the Administering Authority.

In his statement to the Council Mr. Gibbons drew the Council's attention to the situation prevailing in the Territory immediately after the war and compared it with the present situation. We would like an explanation from the Administering Authority about this matter. Mr. Gibbons said that the infrastructure which had existed before the war was totally destroyed. Could the representative of the Administering Authority give us some explanation or make some comment on this matter? In the evidence to the Council it was said that beforehand the Territory showed a positive balance, that it had a positive commercial record, and that at present Palau was importing all its requirements and exporting absolutely nothing. We would appreciate it if the representative of the Administering Authority would comment on that comparison of the situation in the Territory at the start of the Trusteeship and the present situation.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I am going to ask High Commissioner McCoy to respond to the Soviet representative's second question. Let me simply say with respect to his first question that in its operations, in its support, in its financial assistance to the Trust Territory under the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement, in our desire to fulfil all of the obligations we have undertaken under that agreement, we endeavour to set our own priorities, to make our own judgement decisions as to how to conduct the programmes. There have, of course, been

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

substantial funds allotted. The fiscal policies of the United States with respect to the Trust Territory change only in so far as the economic situation of the United States changes. It is manifestly impossible for any country, any Government, to have its financial tune called by the players. In other words, although I can understand the concern of the Special Representative of Palau about reductions in budget, those reductions in budget are widely borne and they are necessary in the present circumstances. It is also a question for the High Commissioner and the Special Representative of Palau and other representatives of his Government to negotiate this over the years. Mrs. McCoy may have more to say on this subject, and I should now like her to answer the second question of the Soviet representative.

Mrs. McCoy (Special Representative): As regards the infrastructure and the destruction of Palau, this is of course a sad topic and a sad situation. It is true that in the heat of war and the antagonisms created by the conflict damage was done to the infrastructure of Palau, just as damage has been done in other parts of the world. However, we would like the Council to note that the infrastructure referred to by Mr. Gibbons had been established by and for the Japanese colonial residents, of which he noted there were about 30,000 compared with the 5,000 to 7,000 Palauans.

It has been the policy of the Administering Authority to provide an infrastructure compatible with the population realities throughout the Trust Territory, including Palau. We do not believe the Council would agree that such an effort should encompass something as labour-intensive as that which existed 40 years ago and which would require a large number of expatriates. We are, as the Council knows, responsible for contributing to the preservation of the culture, as well as to development. To date, \$26.8 million has been spent in capital improvement funds for Palau's infrastructure, and there are commitments for other funds. I should like to point out that that is the second highest amount of capital improvement programme funds anywhere in the Trust Territory. However, I have with me a full breakdown of the capital improvement programmes as they are going on now, and the funding for them. I would be happy to furnish them in complete detail to the Council for further distribution, but with your permission, Mr. President, I will read from the annual report. This is from Palau, and I would point out that this was written and sent in by the Government of Palau.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

"Agriculture. The Agriculture Division is composed of three activities, which include Agriculture General Services, Nekken Forestry, and the Livestock Projects. This sub-activity is making extension trips to Babelthaup and the outlying islands. It is also distributing pieces of planting materials and seeds, 300 purebred piglets, and 61,000 seedlings of trees of economic value to farmers and interested growers.

"The program is providing extension services, to assist the farmers and livestock owners in all 16 states, by visiting farm sites and performing demonstrations on proper agricultural cultivations. Also, the Forestry Extension Services, in co-operation with the Education Department, teaches forestry techniques and principles in all of the elementary schools.

"The year 1981 witnessed an increase in the number of farmers in the Republic. There were four poultry farmers, with an average laying stock of one thousand birds, and thirty vegetable and root crop farmers, for a total number of thirty-four farmers engaged in cash farming.

"The Palau Feedmill began operating in January 1981. The mill utilizes locally available feedstuff mixed with other imported ingredients, to manufacture hog and chicken feeds, at a cost that is lower than complete commercial imported feed. The mill was meeting the Republic's need for animal feeds, with production of animal feeds gradually increasing to fifteen short tons per month.

"The UNDP-Palau joint venture in Livestock Development had fifty-five head of cattle on seventy-seven acres of improved pastures toward the end of 1981.

"Marine Resources. This sub-activity is needed to support the development of marine resources in Palauan waters for both local and export use. The administration and management of the Mariculture Demonstration Center in Palau has been transferred to Palau from the Trust Territory Administration. The Center develops programs in trochus re-seeding, reef fish, and rabbit fish farming, to provide a means for making commercial mariculture productive in Palau.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

Particular efforts are being made to promote technology for the development of commercial tuna and deep bottom fishing by Palauans."

(T/1837, annex, pp. 60-61)

I repeat that this was submitted by the Palauan Government.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In Mrs. McCoy's statement she quoted from pages 60 and 61 of the annual report of the Administering Authority. We have read this part of the report and we know all these data. We should like to have a broader and clearer explanation of the situation which exists in Palau. For example, Mr. Gibbons said that before the war and before the beginning of the trusteeship there existed such forms of economy on Palau as the extraction of phosphate and bauxite. There was mention of enterprises for copper and coal production, the processing of fish products and a number of other branches of industry in which the Micronesian people were engaged. We should like to know which among those sectors of industry which existed previously have been maintained and which have been renewed in this period of 35 years? What has happened in these industrial sectors, a source of employment and livelihood for the Micronesian people living in Palau? That is one part of our question.

The second part relates to the microstructure. Mrs. McCoy told us that the microstructure was destroyed in the fire of war. We understand that military action leads to very great destruction. We, the people of the Soviet Union, know as much as anybody about the destruction caused by war. In Mr. Gibbons's statement a somewhat different impression was given. We were given the impression that the microstructure was destroyed after the war. Mrs. McCoy's words also led us to believe that it was destroyed because a new microstructure had to be created which would be more appropriate to the interests and the local conditions of the Micronesian people. But, if the previous microstructure did not correspond to the interests of the Micronesian people and was not in conformity with the conditions in the Territory, having destroyed one thing it was necessary to create something else as a substitute. So we are concerned with the question of what was created instead. What has the Administering Authority achieved in connexion with the establishment of this microstructure in the 35 years of its trusteeship? Mr. Gibbons said that there are still only eight miles of surfaced roads, and he indicated that these were only completed last year.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

If they appeared last year at the end of the trusteeship of the United States as the Administering Authority and the entire microstructure and all the roads in the Territory are in an exemplary state, we can only welcome this. But I repeat that I do not know what eight miles of road really represents in Palau, since I have never been there and do not know whether it is a lot or very little. But Mr. Gibbons, who is the representative of the people of Palau, surely knows whether eight miles of road is insufficient.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): I should like to invite my friend the representative of the Soviet Union to come to Palau and see it some time. It is a very beautiful place. I do not know whether this is in order, Mr. President.

I think it behoves all of us to remember that one of the responsibilities of the Administering Authority is the preservation and protection of local culture. This has been one of the great conflicts in the development of the islands. If we go into industrial development on a large scale, tradition is threatened. If we ignore development, the people remain at subsistence levels. At some point between the two extremes lies the answer. We strongly feel that it is up to the people to determine what they will give up in order to gain something else. If for this reason we have consistently supported local initiative in private development and have consulted them on their priorities as to what needs to be done, it is because we feel this responsibility very deeply. There are things in Palau now that were never there when the Japanese were there, and some things are gone that were there when the Japanese were there. As regards mining, the war virtually wiped out all the mineral resources during the war. I think a happy balance has to be struck somewhere along the line, and that is what the Administering Authority, along with the Government of Palau, is aiming for.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, I must thank the High Commissioner of Micronesia, Mrs. McCoy, for her kind invitation.

As to the reply to the question asked by the Soviet delegation, I must express profound regret, but that reply did not give us data relating to the Administering Authority's achievements and the success of its efforts in developing the infrastructure. That reply does not give us information as to what has happened in, for instance, the industrial sectors in Palau.

We heard a hint that those sectors are supposedly not of interest to the Micronesian people and do not form part of their present-day lives. I do not know if this is so. Mrs. McCoy said that we have to choose between the traditional crafts and way of life and economic progress - technological progress. Please understand that we do not wish to lecture or to give advice. We are just concerned about the statements we have heard from representatives of the Micronesian people that there is not an infrastructure that would guarantee economic self-reliance for the people. This situation necessarily gives rise to the question of what has been done to ensure the development of this infrastructure and so that the people of the Territory may become self-reliant?

We were told here that the Administering Authority follows the wishes of the people of the Territory most carefully, making sure that they have that which is most appropriate and most likely to promote the development of the Territory's economy. In this connexion, for example, the petitioner, Mr. Guerrero, mentioned in his statement of 19 May the matter of the Micronesian shipping company, the Micronesia InterOcean Line (MILL).

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Fifty per cent of that company belonged to the Micronesians and the other 50 per cent to the Americans. The company was disbanded and ceased to exist. Was that too **done in the interests of the Micronesian people**? Or was it perhaps done in the interests of someone else? That is my question.

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): Mrs. McCoy and the special representative of Palau, Mr. Uherbelau, may subsequently perhaps wish to comment on that question, but first I should again like to point out that when the representative of the Soviet Union cites statements made by petitioners, those are - and I would emphasize this - statements made by petitioners who are acting in their individual capacities and not as duly elected representatives of the Micronesian people. Their point of view, therefore, is essentially an individual point of view and not a co-ordinated point of view representing a large group of people.

Secondly, I would like to point out that infrastructure does not, ipso facto, equate with appropriate development. Indeed, there were substantial industrial enterprises on Palau during the period of Japanese government of the Mandated Territory. They required, in the first instance, large quantities of labour; some 30,000 expatriate Japanese were working in those enterprises. It is manifestly impossible for today's much smaller population of Palau to involve itself to anything like a similar extent in the current situation.

I would ask Mrs. McCoy to comment on the MILI shipping agreement, and then perhaps Mr. Uherbelau would like to state his view as a representative of the Government of Palau.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): Regarding Mr. Guerrero's petition on MILI, the question refers to a subject that is currently under litigation, and we believe that it would be inappropriate for us to comment on the merits of this case.

Mr. UHERBELAU (Special Representative): The representative of the Soviet Union has cited a portion of Palau's official opening statement. If there has been any one thing lacking in Micronesia, and in Palau in particular, it is a strong economic base, and that was what was stressed in our official statement.

This has been because of the very rigorous budgetary process that we must go through each year in order to obtain the necessary funding from the Administering Authority. We have described that situation in our opening statement. Palau is neither a Territory nor a possession of the United States. Nevertheless, it is still part and parcel of the budgetary process of the Department of the Interior. Because of that, our economy has not been developed to a level of self-sufficiency.

We should like, especially during this interim period before the termination of the Trusteeship and especially now that we have become a constitutional Government, to be able to set our own priorities and our own needs and requirements, be they capital infrastructure or economic development programmes. We would like to be able to justify those requirements directly to the United States Congress and not have to submit them through the Office of the High Commissioner to the Department of the Interior and yet still have them subject to the review and approval or disapproval of the Office of Management and Budget of the Executive Branch.

The description that High Chief Ibedul gave in his petition to the Council represents the contrast between the past and the present. I do not think it is fair to compare the cosmopolitan Koror of the 34 or so years of Japanese occupation of Palau with the present-day situation there. With all due respect, circumstances then were different from what they are now. We were then a direct colony of the Government of Japan, but we are now a constitutional Government. In working our way towards self-determination and self-government, however, we still have to have a strong economic base. We therefore ask this Council to support our request to the Administering Authority that during

(Mr. Uherbelau, Special
Representative)

this transitional period we be removed from the budgetary process of the Department of the Interior and be enabled to submit our budgetary requirements to the United States Congress.

In our statement, we also alluded to the 1981 termination date of the Trusteeship: from fiscal year 1982 onward there has not been any request for capital improvement funds. That is because of this rigorous budgetary process. Just last week, we presented a \$US 14,600,000 supplemental request for capital improvements for fiscal year 1983. If we did not have to go through the Department of the Interior and the Office of Management and Budget, that would be submitted to the United States Congress, not as a supplemental request, but as a direct request.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With respect to the last three statements, and especially the statement of the representative of the Administering Authority, we should like once again to stress that the question we put to the Administering Authority on the specific situation in the Republic of Palau was connected with the fact that the Trusteeship Council is considering the situation in the Trust Territory and the question of how the Administering Authority is fulfilling its obligations in terms of the Trusteeship Agreement. We raised this question and drew attention to the statement by Mr. Gibbons, which illustrated the contrasts in the situation, because it was precisely by highlighting the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands that the High Commissioner, Mrs. McCoy, began her statement. She too informed the Council of the contrasts. She compared data relating to today's situation in the Territory with data relating to 20 years ago. We did not, however, get the exhaustive information we wished from Mrs. McCoy's statement, and therefore we are raising these questions now.

Those comments are related to the discussion that has just taken place.

I should like also to make a short comment regarding the statement we have heard twice today from the representative of the Administering Authority: that in its work the Council should adopt a special approach to what has been stated here by the petitioners. That statement, moreover, was made in a tone that implied that the Administering Authority doubts the statements of the petitioners. It is because of that position of the Administering Authority that we are putting our questions. We are trying to get a reaction from the Administering Authority to those statements by the petitioners.

Despite our having been told that the petitioners were speaking not on behalf of the Government of Micronesia but only as individuals, we have not yet seen or heard information which would invalidate what was stated by the petitioners in the Council. From this we must draw the necessary conclusion that this information from people from Micronesia, from representatives of the Micronesian people - even if they are speaking as individuals - has some foundation, not having been refuted by the Administering Authority.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

And how can anyone refute statements to the effect that there is no adequate infrastructure in the Territory? That is difficult, even impossible, to refute, because it is a fact.

At the beginning of our meeting today we spoke of the military activities of the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory. The question of Kwajalein was mentioned specifically, along with the question of the future plans of the United States in this sphere on other atolls and groups of islands. Besides questions relating to the situation with regard to military activities and their consonance with the interests of the people of the Trust Territory, there is a whole range of questions having to do with military bases, military installations, military airfields and the adaptation of port facilities for military purposes. All this is related to how the existence of these military installations and these areas which are specially designed for military use, or how the fact that the Administering Authority adapts them to such activities, affects the life of the Micronesian people; what impact it has on their economic and social development and on the environment in which the Micronesian people live.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

One of the petitioners touched upon this question but, unfortunately, in a very narrow fashion; in order to meet the requirements of the work of the Trusteeship Council we would wish to clarify matters if possible, by putting an additional question to this petitioner so that he can give us his assessment of the military presence of the United States in the Trust Territory. If possible we would wish to put such a question, if, of course, it falls within our time-frame. I realize that this is already the second session today devoted to questions to the Administering Authority, and in addition to this we have other direct questions to put to the Administering Authority. They are serious questions relating to the report for the last period.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I apologize to the representative of the Soviet Union. I did not hear the name of the petitioner whom he wished to question. Would he mind repeating that?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I did not mention the name of the petitioner. It is Mr. Faulkner, who talked about the special question of the military presence of the United States in the Trust Territory, the military activities and construction of military installations, and the effect that is having on the environment in the Trust Territory.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Secretariat informs me that the interpreters have to stop at 6.00 p.m. unless they are given a quarter of an hour's advance warning. I think that the question by the representative of the Soviet Union is particularly detailed and I did not interrupt him, so if this solution is acceptable to him on the one hand and to the Administering Authority on the other, the reply from the Administering Authority and subsequent follow-up questions from the Soviet Union could be resumed on Tuesday morning. Would that solution be acceptable to the members of the Council?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have no objections to this procedure, if it is satisfactory to the other representatives.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As regards the oral hearing of a petitioner, such hearings are concluded and now we have to consider statements from petitioners in writing. However, if the Council did so decide it would of course be possible to hear an oral statement by a petitioner. Mr. Faulkner made an oral statement during the week. Would the members of the Council wish to hear a question addressed to him by the representative of the Soviet Union and a reply by Mr. Faulkner? If the Council were to decide to do that Mr. Faulkner would also be heard on Tuesday.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): May I ask a question please? Is the time still open to question petitioners? It was our understanding that time was allowed to question the petitioners at the end of their statements. We wonder if it is appropriate to reopen the question-and-answer period for petitioners.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): You are absolutely right to say that the hearing of oral statements by petitioners is over, since the Council was asked whether it had completed its questions to the petitioners. However, if the Council wishes it can reopen the hearing of petitioners. In that case it would be up to the Council to decide and that was why I put the question to the members of the Council. Does the Council wish to reopen the hearing of oral statements by petitioners? If there is any doubt, the question could of course be put to a vote.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): Our concern is that petitioners should not be considered as part of the Council itself and should not be involved in debate or cross questioning. Our concern is just where the boundary would be and if this would not be opening a whole new approach.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Your interpretation is absolutely right. You said that at the end of each series of hearings of oral petitioners they are asked to return to the public benches. Petitioners in no way take part in the Council's work. However, they are heard in order to clarify issues for the Council, and if the majority so wish they could be heard once again. However, it is my understanding that the delegation of the United States is not in favour of such a solution. Have I understood your position correctly?

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): Our concern is to know if the Soviet Union is planning to reopen discussion on the statements of several petitioners. If we could be assured that this is a one-and-only instance, rather than the reopening of discussion on all the petitions, we would be ready to make an exception.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Does the representative of the Soviet Union wish to reply to the question raised by the High Commissioner?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I did not think that a delegation's question to the petitioner who had spoken to the Council could cause any procedural difficulties for anyone. The fact is that petitioners speaking here do not have the same possibilities as are available to other participants in the Council, and their oral statements and petitions naturally require careful additional consideration by delegations.

The Council will recall that when the statements were made by the petitioners, the delegations of at least three members of the Trusteeship Council - the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and France - specifically stated that they would need a certain amount of time in order to study the statements made by the petitioners, and possibly to put questions to them at some stage. As you will recall, Mr. President, just an hour ago, I wanted to put a question to Mr. Gibbons and I was not able to do so for the simple reason that he had already left New York. Delegations have only just received records of some of these meetings: it is natural that questions might arise, and to establish rigid conditions at this stage, as suggested by the delegation of the United States, on the basis of exceptions, would not I think be appropriate in the work of the Council.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I would remind the representative of the Soviet Union that a question was put to him. A compromise proposal was made by the representative of the United States, to agree to hear a petitioner but not to reopen the hearing of all oral petitioners, and to press ahead with our subsequent work. May I ask the Soviet representative, if he can agree to the compromise formula? This is intended to facilitate the Council's work. It will be lamentable if we find ourselves without interpretation at ten past six and have taken no decision. The answer would be to take a vote, which would be an astonishing event in the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that to put this question to the vote would be incorrect. Replying to your question, Mr. President, of whether or not I would agree to a compromise solution as suggested by the representative of the United States, I have to point out that it is not a compromise proposal; it is a proposal of principle, just as the proposal of the Soviet Union is. Although the Soviet delegation does not have any other questions to other petitioners, for the time being that is, we do not want and would not be able to accept a "compromise", as you put it, Mr. President. We would not be able to accept such a procedural compromise - which involves more than procedural questions.

Once again I would stress that the Soviet delegation, as well as other delegations, at the time when we were hearing the statements of the petitioners at the beginning, reserved its right to put questions, and what you have described as reopen the hearing of a petitioner is really only putting a question to a petitioner or petitioners and hearing their replies.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I do not see the difference, Sir.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): There is a difference, Mr. President; there is.

Mr. HUMFREY (United Kingdom): I merely wish to propose, at this late hour that perhaps we should avoid the necessity for taking a formal vote on this matter. We have until Tuesday to reach a decision. I do not think a decision taken this evening would be effectively any different from a decision taken first thing on Tuesday morning, and I am sure that, in the spirit of good relations which has traditionally existed between the members of this Council, we can discuss it informally and, I hope, reach an amicable decision on Tuesday morning, if that is acceptable.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for that very constructive proposal.

Mr. BARELLI (France) (interpretation from French): I do understand the views of both the United States and Soviet delegations. As Mrs. McCoy rightly pointed out, petitioners are here in their personal capacity, to express personal views, and in view of that status there can be no question of their taking a full regular part in the work of the Trusteeship Council.

(Mr. Barelli, France)

I think this is quite clear and is accepted by everybody. For our part, when the petitioners made their statements, I said that I would have preferred to wait for the verbatim record of their statements in order to ask questions after studying their statements.

I have a practical suggestion to make. Since between now and Tuesday, when the next meeting is going to be held, we shall be receiving the records of the meetings in which the petitioners took part, perhaps delegations who want to put questions to any of the petitioners could give you, Mr. President, a list of the petitioners they wish to see in the chamber again? We could do this on Tuesday and then we could decide to devote one meeting or part of a meeting next week to putting new questions to the petitioners, on the clear understanding that once the questions had been asked the petitioners would not return and would take no further part in the work of the Council.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): With the agreement of members of the Council, I should like to refer to the organization of work for next week. No meeting is scheduled for 24 May, to allow members of the Council to use that day to prepare statements for the general debate which will take place on Tuesday, 25 May. On Tuesday we shall hold consultations before the formal meeting in order to take a decision, as suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom, on the question of the hearing of petitioners as requested by the representative of the Soviet Union, and perhaps also other petitioners - if those petitioners are still in New York, of course.

Then we would continue consideration of the report of the Administering Authority. The representative of the Soviet Union tells me he has a great many questions to ask, and he will be able to put these questions to the representative of the Administering Authority.

(The President)

We would then come to item 5 of our agenda, the examination of petitions and communications in writing. These are to be found in documents already or shortly to be distributed, the Secretary tells me; namely, documents T/COM.10/L.304 to 309 and T/PET.10/186 to 188 and 192. The Administering Authority has submitted written observations to documents T/PET.10/186, 187 and 188, and these are contained in documents T/OBS.10/53 and 54.

After concluding that, we shall take up the general debate. After the statements in the general debate, if time permits, we shall consider items 7 and 8 on the agenda, that is, "Offers by member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of the Trust Territories" and, secondly, "Dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories".

Pursuant to our tentative time-table, which can always be modified, we have scheduled meetings on Wednesday morning, 26 May, and Thursday afternoon, 27 May, when the Council would begin consideration of items 9, 10, 11 and 12 of its agenda and then proceed in a manner satisfactory to the Council to consider item 6, concerning a visiting mission to the Territory.

On Thursday afternoon, 27 May, the Council will hear the closing statements by the representatives and Special Representatives of the Administering Authority, and will also appoint a drafting committee.

Does any member of the Council wish to comment on the tentative time-table which I have outlined? If not, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Before adjourning the meeting I should like to thank the Special Representatives who will be leaving New York.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.