

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1391
25 May 1972

ENGLISH

Thirty-ninth session

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND
NINETY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 25 May 1972, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. BENNETT (United States of America)

- Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories, for the year ended 30 June 1971: (continued)
 - (a) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
- Hearing of Petitioners

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages (English or French), preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. Corrections should be sent in duplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, Room LX-2332. Corrections received will be issued as corrigendum.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 26 MAY 1972, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 1 JUNE 1972.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITIES ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST TERRITORIES, FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JULY 1971:

(a) TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1735; T/L.1170) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Edward E. Johnston, High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the Special Representative of the Administering Authority, and the Special Advisers, Senator Andon Amaraich and Representative Polycarp Basilius, took places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue the questioning of the representatives of the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): During recent months we have followed very closely and with great interest the negotiations which have taken place, first in Hana and then in Koror, and we are very pleased to learn that considerable progress has been achieved, even if total agreement has not been reached on all points.

Now it appears, according to the statements we heard yesterday, that the subject of these conversations could to a certain extent be prejudiced since the principle of a private negotiation, a particular conversation on the Mariana Islands, has been accepted. The question which arises in the mind of my delegation -- and to a certain extent this complements what was said this morning -- is whether it has been possible to consider, at least in broad outline, how the balance of the Territory could be maintained if, to a certain extent, one of the districts was subtracted from the whole, one of the districts where the headquarters of the Territory's administration is to be found and where most of the salaried labour force and the private companies and, to judge by the statistics to be found in the report, most of the automobiles and trucks are to be found and where there is the largest consumption of kilowatt hours and so on. In other words, how would it be possible to re-establish a balance which would obviously be very much strained if an element were to be subtracted which in many respects, apart from population, is perhaps to most important and the one which has the greatest weight in the present balance of the Territory?

Mr. SACKSTEDER (United States of America): The question formulated just now by the representative of France is one which I should like to characterize at the outset as indicative of the depth of his interest in developments in the Territory. Mr. Blanc, among all our colleagues here, has perhaps the greatest experience of the work of this Council in the last few years and has often demonstrated his detailed knowledge of the situation in Micronesia. I particularly regret, therefore, that I have to call his question, albeit an extremely good one, premature for my delegation to answer. As we indicated this morning, only the very first tenuous and tentative steps have been taken leading to a discussion of some possible alternative outcome for the future of the Marianas as opposed to the rest of the Territory. Therefore, although the problems that Mr. Blanc has evoked, the problems of an eventual separation of the Marianas from the rest of the Territory, are unquestioned and considerable, and subject, of course, to further confirmation, I would have to say that steps have not yet been taken and plans have not yet been made for the eventuality that this does come about.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): We can see that, at any rate, the political evolution of the Territory is going on at a satisfactory pace. I should like to know whether any sort of intermediary or provisional reform or an intermediary stage in that evolution has been envisaged during which in certain fields at least the decisions and the bills passed by the Micronesian Congress would be final and would not be subject to postponement or rejection.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): The question posed by the representative of France refers to the right of the High Commissioner to veto legislation passed by the Congress of Micronesia and the present system of giving the Congress the power to override that veto, but with the eventual power still residing in the United States Secretary of the Interior under the Secretarial Order. A proposal has been made that certain questions pertaining

(Mr. Johnston, Special Representative)

only to matters of local interest might not be subject to the further veto of the Secretary of the Interior, but this proposal has not, to my knowledge, been given any specific consideration. Certainly the entire matter will become a moot question when Micronesia attains a new political status and when the Trusteeship Agreement is eventually terminated. I know of no specific interim measure that is currently contemplated.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): We had frequent occasion this morning to speak on the law which I think is called the Advise and Consent Law, relating to the nomination of a certain number of superior officers with the approval of the elected authorities. I have noticed that that law extends to district heads, if I am not mistaken. What seems to be very important, to me at least, because it is no longer really a question of senior officers but of those on the spot, is this: should we consider the recently adopted reform in the spirit of the Administering Authority or of the elected bodies as being the sign of transformation of the Territory into an entity of a federal nature and no longer a single unit? In other words, would it be correct to consider that this ratification to a certain extent of the nominations of district heads would be a preliminary step towards a transformation of the Territory whereby each of the districts would enjoy more complete autonomy and the Territory would subsequently become a sort of federation; or have I attached too much importance to that decision, which in any event, I think, marks a very important turning-point in the administrative history of the Territory?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): There has been much discussion in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in the past few years about the eventual relationships of the various districts to the central Government. One report of the Committee on Government Organization of the Congress of Micronesia suggested, as I recall, that we should in effect create district governments rather than district administrations. However, no positive steps have been taken in that direction. The one bill which has been introduced and never passed by the Congress of Micronesia was referred to by one of the Special Advisers yesterday as providing for the election of the district administrators. But the bill as introduced merely said that the District Administrator would be elected; he would then still be responsible to the High Commissioner and would be elected to head a government which had not yet been created. It was for this reason, as was correctly stated yesterday, that the Executive Branch opposed that particular piece of piecemeal legislation. It may well be that some time in the future the district governments will be constituted as separate governments in a federation of some sort, but at this point that is pure speculation, and no positive steps in that direction have been taken.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): Some of my colleagues have had occasion to take up discussion of the question of political parties; I shall not therefore dwell on that now. However, I think there is one point that might once again be gone into, and that is not so much that there are not many political parties in Micronesia, but the fact that there is no party that covers the entire Territory. This is a very important matter, I think, because, according to our experience with other, similar Trust Territories, to a certain extent the existence of Territory-wide parties conditions the development of a united Territory.

At a time when it appears that the Territory of the Pacific Islands is drawing nearer to the act of self-determination, is there any indication that experienced politicians in particular, by a process somewhat contrary to what normally happens -- that is, instead of the people being the first to think about the creation of a party and electing politicians, we would see action by politicians who are more aware and more informed of the over-all problems of their Territory -- are trying to agree on setting up a Territory-wide party? So my question is addressed to the Special Representative, and perhaps also to the Special Advisers, who have very special experience in this field. It is as follows: Among what I would call the political élite, among those people who have greater political awareness, are there any elected officials who have thought of the idea of organizing one or more Territory-wide political parties?

So as to avoid having to revert to this question subsequently, I should like to ask also whether, within the context of the political education programme which has been initiated and which was referred to this morning, the accent has been laid on the advantages not of a single party -- because that would involve the Administration -- but on the advantage of having some united action in the Territory and of having discussions about the entire Territory -- in other words, the advantage of being extremely zealous about everything concerning the Territory as a whole, rather than only part of the Territory.

I would therefore add a second question which is germane to the first -- and that is why I am putting them both at the same time. With this in view, has the stress in the political education campaigns been placed on the advantage of unified action -- Territory-wide action, in other words?

(Mr. Blanc, France)

As a subsidiary question related to the same subject, have teachers -- and when I speak of teachers I am thinking of primary school rather than secondary school teachers, since at the secondary level pupils already are becoming more politically oriented than at the primary school level, where children simply need to have a general political education -- been led to give their assistance to this form of education?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): I would feel that since I do not and will not actively participate in elected politics in Micronesia, I would defer that question to one or both of the Special Advisers.

Mr. AMARAICH (Special Adviser): I will try to answer the questions as I understood them. I think the first relates to political parties in Micronesia.

First of all, the formation of political parties will have to come after political education. I think that for the people to be able to decide whether they wish to form political parties they have to know what they are and what benefits they can derive from forming such political parties; and up to now I do not know of any political education programme or anything of that kind that is explaining to the people the benefits or advantages or disadvantages of political parties in Micronesia or anywhere else. Therefore, it would be difficult to say at this time whether or not the establishment of political parties in Micronesia or in any particular district would be advisable.

(Mr. Amaraich, Special Adviser)

With regard to political education in general, I spoke on this subject in my earlier remarks of yesterday, but as it relates to education in general I do not think that the teachers in the educational system are well enough informed to use whatever we have in the way of political education or political materials to acquaint the students with what is going on in the political area or political development in Micronesia.

What little political education, if any, we have so far had has been through the broadcasting stations -- assuming every individual in Micronesia has a radio with which to hear the broadcasts, which is not the case. Therefore it seems to me that if political education is to be effective it should not be from broadcasting stations only but should be going out to the islands by word of mouth and through visits by people from the Political Education Division.

Mr. BASILIUS (Special Adviser): I would add that because of the experience we had in one of the districts in the Trust Territory we realized that there had been no political education before the establishment of political parties in one or two districts in the Trust Territory. Right now, the people of that district are very concerned about the situation because of the political parties now existing in one particular district. People are beginning to wonder whether the political parties will help the people of that district by providing them with information.

The question has arisen whether we should dissolve the political parties or continue to have them in those two districts. I might add that the political parties that exist in the districts have now run counter to the feelings of the people because they contradict the cultures of the people in those districts. I would say that the lack of political education in the Trust Territory has created some problems you are now very concerned about.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): This is a question of detail, but it affects a more general issue. It is indicated in the report that partial elections took place in February 1971 in three constituencies.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

I should simply like to know whether the three vacancies arose because of unfortunate circumstances or were just a matter of chance. Why did three vacancies occur simultaneously? At the same time I would ask whether the population, which already has to go to the ballot boxes every two years, likes to participate in elections which follow upon each other so frequently. I know Micronesia has drawn upon its past experience, but I wonder whether the Micronesian electorate is pleased at having to participate in electoral proceedings quite so often. If not, could better spaced terms of office be envisaged?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): The members of the Senate of the Congress of Micronesia are elected for a period of four years on staggered terms, so that one of the two senators from each district is elected every two years. However, all 21 members of the House of Representatives are elected every two years. Again, I would leave it up to a voting citizen of Micronesia to comment on whether that is considered popular or unpopular.

To answer the specific question posed by the representative of France concerning the special election, a special election was made necessary by an action filed by a citizen of the Palau district who questioned the conduct of the regular election held in November of the previous year. In the Government of the Trust Territory, as is true in many other Governments, the Congress of Micronesia is the sole determining agency of the qualifications of its own members, so when the election was questioned it was thrown into the House and the Senate for decision. The Senate voted by six to five to seat the senator elected from the Palau district. The House of Representatives, on the other hand, voted to throw out the results of the previous election and requested the High Commissioner to call a special election. That special election was called and was held in February 1971. That is the reason for the three vacancies occurring at the same time: a contested election was thrown out by the House of Representatives.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): The events which took place a year and a half ago during the Micronesian fire are well known today. Last year we asked a perhaps premature question in this connexion. Today that question may be more timely. Could we have information regarding the circumstances of that fire and any possible prosecution or sentences imposed in that connexion.

Mr. JOFNSTON (Special Representative): I may say there is no subject I would less rather discuss than the disastrous fires in Micronesia. One of them destroyed the halls of the Congress of Micronesia; the other destroyed my residence and a great many of my personal possessions.

We have made every effort to determine what or who caused the fires. They were both very definitely and indisputably caused by arson. There was absolutely no element of accidental fire in either case. One man was arrested and charged with arson, brought to trial and subsequently acquitted. The case is still under very active investigation. A reward of US\$2,000 has been offered for information leading to the arrest and conviction of the guilty parties, and I am sure that both the Executive Branch and the Congress of Micronesia share the hope that the case will eventually be solved. But I regret to report at this time that although one individual has been charged he has been acquitted, and that is the present situation.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): Departing now from structural questions but remaining within the political area -- this time maritime -- I should like to ask a brief question which is rather technical in nature. How does one compute the base lines in defining territorial waters? In particular I should like to know whether the so-called right base-line method is used which considerably modifies the limits of a territorial area as compared to the former method which followed the coastline.

Mr. SACKSTEDER (United States of America): We would ask the representative of France to permit us to investigate this question which, as he indicated, is somewhat technical and for which we do not have a ready reply and to include this reply in our closing remarks.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to turn to the economic field in general, and again this might be a slightly technical question. On page 54 of the report we read that the national product -- and the text indicates the figure for consumption and investment -- amounted to about \$63.8 million. Knowing that the budget -- that is to say, the grant, the territorial budget and the municipality represent budgets -- about \$75 million, my delegation is rather perplexed about this global income which is smaller than the budget. On page 293 of the report it is indicated with a great deal of common sense, with which we associate ourselves, that it is very difficult to establish specific statistics in this field particularly when we juxtapose income in dollars and income approximately calculated for the traditional activities. None the less, if the Special Representative could give us some additional explanations -- and I understand that he may not be able to do this now -- as regards this problem of the national income and the results that are indicated here, as well as the degree of approximation of these figures, my delegation would be most grateful to the Administering Authority and its Special Representative. Perhaps they may be able to do it right now; if so, we would appreciate it even more.

Mr. SACKSTEDER (United States of America): We shall avail ourselves of the representative of France's offer to allow us a little time to look into this. My delegation is not, regrettably, in a position to answer immediately this rather complex technical question.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): We heard with great interest yesterday in the opening statements and this morning in the replies to questions references to the Planning Committee. My delegation is happy with what it heard this morning and would like to ask a question. We know that the members of the Committee will start their work very soon and that in fact they will be meeting every week. Does there exist at present -- not a plan of course because the Committee was created to draw up a plan -- at least a co-ordinated programme? I seem to recall that some years ago, in 1967 or 1968, the Territory had benefited from the assistance of a private enterprise that had published a very important piece of work on this question of economic planning. My question is whether now, even before the first results of the work of the Committee, there exists, at least in some areas and particularly in the infrastructure, any co-ordination between the various activities which might play a role of provisional planning, at least provisional schematic planning.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): Although there was an obvious and definite need for the additional co-ordination of all planning efforts, I would certainly not want to create the impression that prior to the appointment of this particular Committee we had been totally drifting. In the first place, we do operate basically under the United States Federal budget system. Since the budget for the Federal grants to the Trust Territory is a part of the budget of the United States Interior Department, the entire process involves a five-year plan modified each year for five years in the future. The Joint Committee of the Congress of Micronesia is in fact known as the Joint Programme, Planning and Budget Committee, or Planning and Budget Committee, and we do have our expenditures and our programmes which will receive those expenditures planned five years in advance.

(Mr. Johnston, Special Representative)

As far as physical master planning is concerned, starting in 1968 an organization was hired to do physical master plans of each of our major district centres and some of our sub-district centres. Subsequently we have gradually, as funds would permit, included other islands away from the district and sub-district centres so that a great many of our population centres are now master-planned. These master plans are subject to the wishes of each individual district or island which is master-planned; it is not a centralized official master plan adopted by either the Administration or the Congress of Micronesia for the entire Territory. As a way of co-ordinating the efforts of our various programmes, our Cabinet Officers meet once a week to discuss any matters which may involve co-ordination of departments in our over-all planning and carrying out of the plans and then the managers of our eight major programme departments, the programme managers, meets an additional two times a week with the Deputy High Commissioner for further co-ordination of our efforts. So we do make every effort to co-ordinate our planning and feel that the Committee which will concern itself with both short-range and long-range planning will serve as a further agency to pull not only the departments in the administration but also the legislative branch of the Government into one co-ordinated planning effort. I might say that one of the products, indeed the first product, of this Committee is one of the largest charts that we have ever had available in the Trust Territory and I would be glad to furnish this to the Secretariat to be made a matter of record in the proceedings of this Council.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you very much; I think that would be useful.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): In the area of production the report indicates that, unfortunately, there was a decrease last year in the export of fish and in the production of copra, and it seems also in the export of meat products. In the case of copra this trend seems to be related to the urbanization of the population, which results in a reduction in the number of farmers and, indirectly, in a lack of manpower in the rural areas.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

Unfortunately, this phenomenon exists in the rest of the Pacific and it would seem that the results are the same in these other areas. Are they considered as short-term trends or does the Administration consider that a long-term trend of this kind has begun and that, therefore, with urbanization the drop in production will continue from year to year?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): As far as copra production is concerned it is a little hard to predict whether production will continue to go down or might some day increase. At the present time the copra market is depressed, having dropped from \$145 to \$110 per short ton during the first half of the current fiscal year. Our Copra Stabilization Fund has been tapped rather heavily, and with copra becoming a declining item as far as the financial reward for harvesting copra is concerned it may well be that copra production will continue to decline. It seems to me that one of the motives for any type of commercial production -- whether it is agricultural or otherwise -- is an adequate reward for a man's labour. We in the Trust Territory, as well as in some other parts of the world, are all concerned about the future of the copra market. In the other area, certainly every effort will be made to increase production. As I mentioned this morning, we are definitely putting more financial resources and more effort into increasing our marine resources, and certainly this is an area where production should go up greatly. I would say that the only area that might possibly continue to show a decline would be that of copra production.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): As regards fishing the report gives interesting information on the co-operation which has taken place between an industrial company, the Van Camp Sea Food Company, and the Micronesians, the former having given to the latter free of charge three tuna-fishing boats. Could we have some further indications of that interesting example of co-operation between a large company and local fishermen?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): The Committee of the House of Representatives on Resources and Development -- which members of the Council will recall was mentioned yesterday in our opening remarks and, I believe was referred to this morning -- submitted a report early this year on the Micronesians' view of economic development in the Trust Territory. At the same time it submitted a very comprehensive report on the Van Camp fisheries operation in the Palau District. The Van Camp Company is the sole owner of that operation. It does operate some fishing boats and it does receive and freeze the catch of some locally owned fishing boats. The Van Camp Company, with the urging of our Government, has made greater strides in the past year or so in training Micronesian fishermen, but it has not made any particular strides towards setting up a Micronesian corporation or company of any kind to take over the operation.

However, I might add that in each of our districts various companies are dealing with the local people through the District Economic Development Boards and making proposals to set up fishing ventures in the districts. When they first make an application, companies are told by the executive branch that the success of their venture will of necessity depend upon the degree to which they will involve the Micronesian citizens both in the ownership and in the management of their ventures. Several of these applications are now pending. There is quite active competition in the districts among major fishing companies to put together some kind of an operation which will be a truly joint venture between a non-domestic company and the domestic economy. I think that certainly within the next twelve months we shall see considerable progress in this area on lines different from those of the Van Camp operation, which was set up a number of years ago.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): The report indicates that in the area of tourism efforts are being made not to reduce the Micronesians to the role of "drivers" and "bellboys". What practical means are there to ensure that the inhabitants of the Territory do not remain in those roles?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): As far as the tourism industry is concerned, as we mentioned before, each administrative district will have its own Tourism Advisory Council and will determine the degree of tourism. In one district the District Legislature and prominent individuals have firmly opposed the building of a hotel with any outside capital whatsoever. They prefer to build their own hotels and have several under construction as well as a few small ones actually in operation. In that district -- the Ponape District --- there is certainly no question about the degree to which the local citizens will participate in the tourism business, since they will be the owners, managers and operators of the hotels and the tourist-related facilities. This is being encouraged. In some of the districts they will choose to use outside capital to assist in building up tourism; in others they will probably take a little longer but do it completely with local capital. I can assure the Council that one of the efforts of the Micronesian Occupational Center is to train people at all levels, including top management, of the hotel, tourist and related-services businesses. I might also point out, however, to the representative of France that an American citizen who started out as a bellboy in a hotel is now the President of United Air Lines, the largest domestic airline in America.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): The Bank of Micronesia has been set up. In the credit market how does the action of this Bank fit in between the traditional private banks and the Economic Development Loan Fund whose activities we have been following in recent years? I think that the Bank falls between these two categories of credit organizations, but exactly how is it situated? What is its particular sphere of action?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): The Economic Development Loan Fund, of course, makes loans only to Micronesian citizens -- no loans are made to outside organizations of any kind. The Micronesian citizen first of all goes to one of the private banks and attempts to secure a loan. In some communities where similar economic development funds are organized, there must be three or four letters of rejection from major banks. Banking is not that well organized in the Trust Territory. There are only two banks and usually in a given district only one of those banks is operating. But once the citizen has been unable to secure a loan from the bank, he may apply to the Economic Development Loan Fund Board. That Board can grant two types of loans. The first is a direct loan where the money is taken out of the Economic Development Loan Fund and given to the individual to start his business or improve his business or expand it. The other type is a guaranteed loan in which we participate with a bank or the United States Small Business Administration, where the Economic Development Loan Fund actually puts up only 25 per cent of the total amount to guarantee the payment of the loan and the balance of the loan comes from the regular lending agency. We have tried to make the maximum use of that type of guaranteed loan because it makes our money go further and we get four times the mileage out of any given amount of money that is placed in the rotating Economic Development Loan Fund. Does that answer the question of the representative of France?

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): I was curious to know exactly the place occupied by the Bank of Micronesia among these various organizations, and that of the Fund as well.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): The Bank of Micronesia Bill created a Committee chaired by the Deputy High Commissioner to study and establish the exact position that the Bank of Micronesia would occupy and to report back, I believe, to the Congress of Micronesia at its next session. The bank is scheduled to be organized in 1973. However, the Bill as it now exists and as it became law merely provides for the study to create the bank. Before a bank is actually created the Congress of Micronesia will of necessity have to pass some banking laws and set up the conditions under which a bank can be formed in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. When that is done we shall be in a better position to answer the question as to exactly what place the Bank of Micronesia would take in the over-all financial picture in the Trust Territory.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): From the documents it becomes quite clear that the Administration is endeavouring to reconcile two main concerns, almost opposite to each other. First, there is the desire to attract capital into the Territory -- with a system of control which was described to us, a system of district development boards for each district. On the other hand, there is a rule which restricts the right of investment to certain nationals. How is it possible to reconcile these two opposing trends: one to increase investment and the other to restrict these investments?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): Might I say to the representative of France that if I knew the answer to that question I would be a much happier man today. It is one of our problems. It is the one that has possibly been the most perplexing to me as an individual because I ... served for a number of years as the Chairman of a State Board of Economic Development whose sole purpose for existing was to attract capital, not in any way to discourage it. Operating under a system which needs outside capital, quite obviously, to prosper and move ahead and yet which because of certain built-in characteristics of necessity discourages that very investment that it needs to move ahead is a very perplexing problem, and I do hope that we come up with a solution some time in the foreseeable future.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): I am somewhat disturbed by the length and the number of the questions that I have to ask. I shall have to stop soon; otherwise I shall bore the Council. But I should like to ask two or three more brief questions, one which is of particular interest to me. It concerns the action which we referred to last year -- the action of the land commissions. I should like to know what, in rough outline, were the results of the initial actions undertaken by these commissions and the registration teams which started to tackle this work some time ago? Would it be possible for us to have a brief description of how this important operation is progressing?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): The land tenure programme or the land identification programme has been moving ahead in five of our six districts. The people of the Marshalls District, because of the extremely complicated nature of the traditional land ownership system in that district, have requested a delay in the start of the programme and since we could not do the entire programme at once, by any stretch of the imagination, we have not actively started the programme in the Marshalls District at this time. However, we have made considerable progress and I will be very happy to include more specific statistics in our closing statement to the Council.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): I should simply like to make a suggestion. If the Council subsequently has further information given to it about this land reform, I should be very pleased to know how it was possible to carry out the reform despite the absence of any kind of land gazette, which would appear to be an essential part of the procedure. It is rather a technical point, but I think it is a question we can ask when we get further indications about the whole outline of the land reforms. Perhaps I misread the report, in which case I apologize, but I did not find any information about the percentage of capital of Air Micronesia which belongs either to the Territory or to Micronesians through the United Micronesian Development Association. Could this gap in my knowledge be filled in? If it is in the report, I could not find it and I apologize.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): As far as the land programme is concerned, if I may answer that first, it is not a land reform programme; it is merely a land identification programme. We are making no attempt whatsoever at this point to change any traditional systems of ownership, but merely to identify parcels of land by their proper boundaries. As far as the ownership of Air Micronesia is concerned, at the present time the stock is owned 51 per cent by the United Micronesian Development Association (UMDA), 29 per cent by Continental Airlines, a United States corporation, and 20 per cent by Aloha Airlines of Hawaii, also a United States corporation.

The UMDA, which is primarily Micronesian-owned, does have the right within the next, I believe, three years to buy an additional 9 per cent of the stock from the other two stockholders, which would give them then 60 per cent.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): If I can trust the report and my recollection, because we have referred to this previously, there are only two districts which are not directed by a District Commissioner who is a Micronesian. If I have made a mistake, of course I hope that I will be corrected. But if I am not mistaken, is this because these districts are more difficult to administer than the others?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): In view of the fact that there are present in this room citizens of all but one of our six districts, I would not attempt to make a statement as to which district is the easiest and which the most difficult to administer. However, I will say that the choice of District Administrators certainly has nothing to do with that. One of the District Administrators, Mr. Leonard Aguigui, is a Micronesian by birth but is an American citizen, and he is the District Administrator of our smallest district.

The other District Administrator who is not a Micronesian citizen, Mr. Boyd MacKenzie, is a part-Hawaiian individual. He is our senior District Administrator, and has at one time or another served in, I believe, four of our six districts. Again, his continuation as a District Administrator has nothing to do with the difficulty of administration or the size of the district.

Our programme of replacing the District Administrators with Micronesian citizens has proceeded along the lines of a replacement with a qualified individual when two conditions are met: first, that the qualified individual is available, and secondly, that the citizens of that particular district seem to approve of or would definitely approve of the change. Neither of the two districts in which there is non-citizen administrator is at the current time, to any degree whatsoever unhappy with its District Administrator. In fact, both districts have officially requested that the particular individual remain in his position.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): The following are my two last questions. The first one is with regard to the standard of living. Very roughly, what would be the average ratio between the earnings of the salaried Micronesian -- that is usually civil servants, officials -- and the fisherman or the Micronesian who lives on his traditional resources or agricultural resources, including, of course copra. It is an order of magnitude. I do not want the precise figure here, but I think that we should be able to approximately gauge the ratio between the salaried person and the typical farmer or fisherman.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): We seem to have reached a consensus that probably the average Micronesian employee of the Government, which is the main source of employment, would be earning about \$US 3,000 a year, and that if the income of the subsistence farmer or the outer islander who exists on a subsistence rather than a cash economy were converted to cash it would probably be in the neighbourhood of \$US 800 a year.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): My last question is this. When will the reinstallation at Bikini be completed?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Special Representative): I am not sure that I can give an absolutely specific answer to that question. The programme originally was designed so that the owners of Bikini would move from Kili Island to Bikini Island at such time as the coconut and breadfruit trees which have been planted were bearing fruit and were able to sustain the economy. However, we have in the past year been through numerous discussions with the citizens of Bikini and they have expressed a continually increasing desire to move back ahead of that schedule perhaps. In order for this to be made possible we will have to work out some means of providing them with subsistence prior to the time that the island is again able to sustain life at the required level.

The construction of homes is proceeding and, I believe, will be completed this year. Then various public buildings will be constructed shortly after that.

(Mr. Johnston, Special Representative)

I would say that the Bikinians could move back to their island certainly within the next two years, but it will still be another four to five years before the coconut trees and the breadfruit trees will be fully matured so that they will not need any additional subsistence support. I am sure that by the time the Council meets next year we shall have solved some of these problems and shall be again on a more definitive schedule, a better time-table for when they will be moving back. The citizens of Bikini have participated at every stage of the rehabilitation and there has been a considerable amount of mind-changing by the local leaders regarding the schedule for returning to Bikini.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to thank the representative of the United States, the Special Representative and his Special Advisers for the extremely comprehensive replies they have given to my questions.

The PRESIDENT: I note the presence in the Chamber of several members of legislatures who are concerned with matters that we are discussing today. We have in the Chamber Speaker Bethwell Henry of the Congress of Micronesia from the Ponape District. We welcome him back to New York. Also, Senator Petrus Tun from the District of Yap, who was the Special Adviser at the thirty-eighth session of the Trusteeship Council, is here. We welcome him. We also have Representative Thomas Foley from the State of Washington, who is with the House Committee on Insular Affairs. He was also here with us last year and has demonstrated a keen interest in the work of this Council. I welcome Representative Foley.

HEARING OF PETITIONERS

The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council will recall our decision of this morning concerning oral hearings, to which we shall now proceed.

In that connexion, the Secretariat has received only today a letter from the Executive Secretary of the Mariana Islands District Legislature, which encloses a special resolution. The letter did not arrive in time to allow for its distribution and it will be in the regular distribution tomorrow. Meanwhile, informal copies have been prepared and will be distributed to members of the Council at this time.

I should like now to invite the following petitioners to take their places at the petitioners' table: Mr. Edward Dlg. Pangelinan of the Marianas District, Mr. Herman Q. Guerrero of the Marianas District, Mr. Olympio T. Borja of the Marianas District, and Mr. Vicente N. Santos of Saipan.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Edward Dlg. Pangelinan, Mr. Herman Q. Guerrero, Mr. Olympio T. Borja and Mr. Vicente N. Santos took places at the petitioners' table.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Pangelinan to make his statement.

Mr. PANGELINAN: Mr. President, on behalf of the members of the special delegation from the Marianas, it is my privilege to extend to you and the members of the Trusteeship Council our appreciation for the opportunity to appear before the Council this afternoon as petitioners.

With your permission, Mr. President, I should like to take the opportunity to introduce to you the members of our delegation. On my far left we have Mr. Vicente N. Santos, President of the Mariana Islands District Legislature; next to him is Mr. Olympio T. Borja, Senator from the Marianas in the Congress of Micronesia; to my left Mr. Herman Q. Guerrero, representative from the Marianas in the Congress of Micronesia; and I am Edward Pangelinan, Senator from the Marianas in the Congress of Micronesia.

Each one of us will be making individual remarks in this meeting this afternoon. At the conclusion of our statements we shall be very happy to respond to any questions which any member of the Council may wish to direct to our delegation.

Copies of our statements have been transmitted to you, Mr. President, and we should like to request that they be made available to members of the Council for their reference. At this time, I should like to make my remarks.

I appear before the Council today as a petitioner, an elected representative of all of the people of the Mariana Islands District of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and a special delegate of those people. I have come here today to speak on but one issue, yet perhaps it is this issue which concerns all of us in Micronesia most. It is the issue of our future political status.

The people of the Marianas desire a close political relationship with the United States of America, much closer than that presently being considered by the Congress of Micronesia and its Joint Committee on Future Status. For this reason, it is the position of the Mariana Islands delegation to the Congress that a separate Statement of Position on the issue of future political status is necessary.

Consequently, we have prepared this separate Statement of Position on the issue of future political status because, in our opinion, the actions of the Congress of Micronesia and, by its mandate, the Joint Committee on Future Political Status, have moved further and further away from a position of close political affiliation with the Government of the United States of America. The majority of the people of the Mariana Islands District, as expressed through our representatives in Congress, and through them, the District Representatives on the Joint Committee, feel that the direction endorsed by the Joint Committee is not in the best interests of the people of the Mariana Islands District.

It must be stated at the outset that mere separation for separation's sake is not and has not been our aim. We advocate our present position for the sole reason that we desire a close political union with the United States of America -- a membership in the United States political family, and a future political status which the Joint Committee, its predecessors, and the Congress of Micronesia as a whole has rejected.

More than any other nation with which we have had contact, the United States has brought to Micronesia the values which we cherish and the economic goals which we desire. A close political affiliation with the United States -- closer than that of "Free Association" --- holds a promise for our future of preserving those values and the implementation of those goals.

We have travelled extensively throughout our District with other members of our delegation. We have visited the Islands of Rota, Tinian and the northern islands, and have met with the people of Saipan, and we find that the vast majority of our people share the views presented to you in this statement.

What, then, are these values and goals? The values are human rights. Micronesia has for too long been dominated by autocratic Powers, with little regard for the rights of their own subjects, let alone of Micronesians. The coming of the United States, on the other hand, changed all this. The spirit of 200 years of democracy, of a society which practised the theory that a government should be "of the people, by the people, and for the people," of the Bill of Rights, ensuring that every man is created equal under the law and guaranteeing his human rights, of a country which has historically been a refuge for the oppressed and a land of opportunity for all people, was brought to Micronesia by the United States. Thanks to this great country, Micronesians now live as free men for the first time in four and a half centuries.

(Mr. Pangelinan)

Political union with the United States will ensure that we keep this freedom so long denied us. With this freedom, of course, come obligations. We recognize the United States position that political stability in Micronesia is the key to the effort to maintain peace and security in the Pacific. As a member of the Pacific Community, as a people which has been ravaged by war within the memory of every single member of this Council, we cannot say too strongly that peace must reign in the Pacific, and that war must never again destroy our islands. For this reason, we desire to make our contribution to the United States, which promises to keep the peace, as our share in the maintenance of peace and security in the Pacific.

The goal is economic development. Simply stated, we are of the opinion that the United States has more to offer Micronesia in this area than any other nation. It seems to be the general conclusion in Micronesia that some form of association is necessary to ensure the continuation of the process of economic development. A thorough study of the possessions, Territories, and other members of the United States political family makes it very clear that a close political relationship can ensure that degree of economic development which our people desire. American Samoa, an unincorporated United States Territory, as compared with independent Western Samoa, is one example. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, with by far the highest per capita income and standard of living in the Caribbean, is another. And closer to home, in Micronesia, one has only to compare economic development on Guam, an unincorporated United States Territory, with that of its sister islands of Micronesia.

Further, a brief examination of world political and economic conditions shows a high correlation between political stability and economic development. We remain uncertain about a future for Micronesia when the relationship under which that future will take place is itself intentionally and specifically made uncertain. We are prepared to become a permanent member of the United States political family for the sake of political stability, without which there can be no economic stability.

(Mr. Pangelinan)

We are not afraid of possible abuse under such an agreement with the United States. We know that the United States is not a perfect country; in today's world, we doubt that any country so large and complex could be. But we are satisfied that the United States Constitution offers us enough latitude to be able to protect our people from loss of their lands or wholesale economic domination by outsiders, and also to control the rate and nature of this development at a satisfactory level. Neither do we abrogate our rights to negotiate with the United States toward the most favourable resolution of our own position on such specific issues as may arise.

It has been noted that close affiliation with the United States will have the effect of assimilation of our culture into that of the United States. We recognize this. Our culture in the Marianas, however, has been already considerably affected by foreign cultures: Spanish, German and Japanese, as well as American. We view this phenomenon as a necessary adjunct to the process of economic development. Further, we find that this amalgamation has worked toward the strengthening of our people, and has reinforced our desire for social advancement.

In short, we believe that close political ties with the United States, such as were embodied in the 1970 Commonwealth Proposal, represent the ideal goal for the people of the Marianas. The Congress of Micronesia, and through it the Joint Committee, had rejected this proposal. We believe further that the concept of free association, as mandated by the Congress of Micronesia and interpreted by the Joint Committee on Future Status, does not and cannot meet the needs or satisfy the desires and aspirations of the people of the Marianas District.

The recent Third Round of Negotiations, held at Hana, Maui, and the Fourth Round of Negotiations held at Koror, Palau, has indicated to us that the Congress, through the Joint Committee, seeks goals other than those which we of the Marianas desire. While we respect and defend the right of all of the people of Micronesia to the free choice of political status, we are of the opinion that the direction taken within the past two years toward free association or independence differs so considerably from our own desired direction that we feel we cannot be parties to the achievement of that choice.

(Mr. Pangelinan)

Accordingly, at the close of the Fourth Round of Negotiations in Koror, the Mariana Islands District representatives on the Joint Committee transmitted a request to the United States delegation asking whether the United States would be willing to consider separate negotiations with a Mariana Islands District Future Political Status Commission. The United States delegation responded affirmatively to that proposal. The only choice open to us is a separate political destiny.

I am, therefore, privileged to report to you today that legislation has been introduced in the Mariana Islands District Legislature authorizing the creation of a separate Future Political Status Commission for the Marianas District, empowered to enter into and conduct separate negotiations with the United States regarding a future political status for the Mariana Islands.

Members of the Council should be assured, however, that the Marianas delegation pledges its full, complete and unequivocal support of the right of the Congress of Micronesia and of the Joint Committee to seek the attainment of whatever future political status they aspire to, and respectfully requests that other delegations reciprocate with regard to the position of the people of the Marianas.

The people of the Mariana Islands District have asked me to express their hope to the members of this Council today that the Council will look favourably upon the political aspirations of the people of the District, and upon separate negotiations with the United States devoted to the achievement of that status. We believe that we, like all of the people of Micronesia and of the world, have the right to choose our own political destiny and, in making such choice, to assure for ourselves the freedoms guaranteed to us by the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement.

At this point I would like to refer to one of the cynical remarks in the statement made by the Special Adviser on 22 May 1972 regarding the interest of the United States in attempting to foster disunity in the Trust Territory and to fragmentize Micronesia. I would like the record to show that the United

(Mr. Pangelinan)

States has never taken the initiative to foster disunity or fragmentation in Micronesia. The record is very clear regarding the position of the Marianas: for the past 12 years we have petitioned this august body by resolutions of our District Legislature and our Municipal Councils, and we have appeared personally today in evidence of our interest.

That is all. I appreciate very much the opportunity to have spoken before the Council.

Mr. GUERRERO: I am indeed very grateful for this opportunity to appear before the Council to present an issue which is very close and most important to our people -- that is, the future political status of the Mariana Islands.

The Mariana Islands District, together with the five other districts which comprise the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, were placed under the legal jurisdiction of the United Nations. Since the date of the Trusteeship Agreement between the United States and the United Nations -- 18 July 1947 -- the United States has exercised direct supervision over the Trust Territory as the Administering Authority. Under the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement the United States is obligated among other things to promote the inhabitants of the Trust Territory toward self-government in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. This principle of self-determination is, I feel, the most important part of the entire Trusteeship Agreement, and it is that subject upon which I have come to speak to you today. In accordance with the principle of self-determination as recognized by the United Nations, and in my role as an elected representative of the people of the Mariana Islands District, it is my solemn obligation to advise this Council of the political aspirations of our people and of the long quest for the fulfilment of those aspirations.

Over the course of 451 years our people have experienced the dominance of four foreign Powers in Micronesia. By virtue of annexation or conquest, and without our consultation and consideration, our homes and lives were abruptly changed.

The first Western visitor to Micronesia, Ferdinand Magellan, claimed the islands in the name of Spain in 1521. Spain ruled Micronesia for almost 380 years. At the end of the Spanish-American war in 1899 most of ethnic Micronesia, and all the islands which now comprise the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, were sold to Germany. Our neighbouring island of Guam, inhabited by our Chamorro cousins, was ceded by Spain to the United States. The Germans, too, were unable to hold Micronesia due to increasing military pressures and demands in other parts of the world. As Germany moved out, Japan moved in. It later legitimized its claim to Micronesia through a mandate granted by the League of Nations. Micronesia remained a Japanese mandate until the closing days of the Second World War, when these islands were wrested inch by inch, at tremendous cost, from the Japanese by the forces of the United States. Within three years

(Mr. Guerrero)

thereafter the United States had concluded and signed with the United Nations a Trusteeship Agreement for Micronesia. This Trusteeship Agreement has been in effect since 1947, or for almost 25 years.

It is well to point out again that all this foreign domination in Micronesia -- domination over our land, our peoples -- was accomplished without consultation with or acquiescence by the people of Micronesia. Never was there an opportunity for our people to have the option to speak out on the important matters which faced them, such as the nature of their Government, the development of their country and their future.

The United Nations has always recognized the fundamental right of all people to determine their political future. The provisions of the United Nations Charter, which are reiterated in the Trusteeship Agreement, make it very plain that all people have the right to run their own lives and to have and be free to exercise the fundamental freedoms and rights which are the property of every man.

Over the many years of foreign domination our people have had the opportunity to examine the political and social systems of each of our foreign rulers. During all those years we have had a chance to observe closely the systems of the administrators and how they reflected themselves in the quality of our lives, especially in relation to human rights. The Spanish Administration brought us Roman Catholicism, which is today the faith professed by virtually all the inhabitants of the Marianas and well over half of all the people of Micronesia. Germany concentrated as much on commerce in Micronesia as did the Spanish on religion. The Japanese Administration achieved notable successes in the field of economic development, although it is true that most of that development accrued directly to the benefit of Japanese firms and individual entrepreneurs. The local people were afforded only a very limited opportunity to advance their educational level, and human rights and dignity were privileges reserved exclusively for the Japanese.

The coming of the Americans ushered in a new era for us. For the first time in four centuries we could enjoy the fundamental human rights to which all men are entitled. America brought us economic development, education and health care. More important, America taught us how to live as free men. Thus, after so many years, we have come to begin to see the day when we will be able to run our own Government. As a direct result, we are beginning to take

(Mr. Guerrero)

more seriously our obligation to ourselves and our people -- our obligation to arrive at a system of government which will be most beneficial to our people, a government that will continue to assure the fundamental equality of all men and protect and preserve the other fundamental human rights.

Our people, after a quarter-century of American administration, have come to know the American system of government. The concept of democracy has become very important to us. As a result we have been very active in expressing our wishes as to the form our future Government will take. We want a political system which will incorporate us into political union with the United States.

For more than a decade our people through their duly elected representatives have on numerous occasions expressed both formally and informally to the Congress of Micronesia, to the Government of the United States and to the United Nations, through petitions and through plebiscites, our strong desire that the Marianas become a part of the United States. The plebiscites which have been held in the Marianas are probably the best indicators of popular sentiment. In the most recent district-wide plebiscite, conducted in 1969 by the Mariana Islands District Legislature, the people of the Marianas again voted for close political union with the United States. A 1971 survey, conducted after the commonwealth offer had been made, reaffirmed that result.

At this stage it must be pointed out that we do not as yet have any specific political arrangement in mind. The possibilities are, of course, numerous. They include reintegration with the unincorporated United States Territory of Guam, incorporation as a separate Territory, attaining a commonwealth status, and other possible arrangements. It is our intention to arrive at a solution to the problems of our political future through studies of the available alternatives, through discussions among our people and eventually by formal negotiations with the United States. We should like to assure this Council that whatever the nature of our future association with the United States may be it will provide for as much self-government as is possible within the system. And it will come into effect only after the people of the Marianas, in a sovereign act of self-determination, have voted and approved it.

(Mr. Guerrero)

In conclusion, we in the Mariana Islands are most appreciative to the Trusteeship Council for its long and dedicated assistance and guidance during these many years, and especially in the past few years, when our political maturity was in its formative stages. All of us would again like to express our gratitude not only to the members of the Council but to each and every Member of the United Nations for guaranteeing to us the inherent rights of all men everywhere to choose their own political destiny.

The people of the Marianas have officially announced that they are ready to exercise their basic right of self-determination. We have explored the possibility of negotiations with the United States Government toward a new and great future political status for our people, and we have received an encouraging reply to that exploration. We are hopeful that these negotiations can take place as soon as possible so that the matter of our future political status can be resolved. I am confident that our future promises a new and better government in political union with the United States and, as a result, a new and better way of life for our people.

Mr. President, let me express my thanks to you and to the members of the Council for allowing us to appear here today.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on Mr. Olympio T. Borja to make his statement.

Mr. BORJA: May I first express my deep gratitude to the Council for allowing me and the other members of the Mariana Islands delegation, Senator Edward Pangelinan, Congressman Herman Q. Guerrero and President of the District Legislature Vicente W. Santos, to appear before the Council today as petitioners.

We have come to speak to the Council today on the important subject of the future political status of the people of the Mariana Islands District. As the Council may know, the recent fourth round of negotiations between the United States and Micronesia, held at Koror, Palau, just this past April, saw a proposal by the representatives of the Mariana Islands District for separate negotiations on the issue of future political status for the Marianas to the United States. In that proposal Senator Pangelinan and Congressman Herman Guerrero said that the people of the Marianas desired a close political relationship with the United States and membership in the United States political family. With the Council's kind permission I should like to go into some of our reasons.

When American soldiers came to Saipan in 1944 they were truly our liberators. The yoke of the Japanese Empire weighed heavily on our shoulders for 30 years before that time; the people of the Marianas were little better than slaves, cogs in the Japanese military-industrial machine. We could not speak our own language in many places; we were relegated to menial jobs; we could not rise above an elementary education. Even the economic prosperity which the Japanese mandate had brought to the Marianas was a Japanese prosperity, not a Saipanese one.

After the Americans came, slowly but surely things began to change. The American Administration guaranteed to us the fundamental freedoms which are the right of all men, as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights says. None of us had ever known these freedoms before. All of us, I think, wanted to make certain that we should never again lose them. Sentiment for joining the United States political family was born.

(Mr. Borja)

Over the years the people of the Marianas came to see how much a close relationship with the United States could be of great benefit. We had only to go to Guam, or to write to our many relatives there, to have constant reminders of how much better things could be economically, socially and politically.

Even before the early 1960s, when the administration of the Marianas Islands was turned back from the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Interior, sentiment had already begun to wax strong in the Marianas. Our people differed not in our goal, which was always union with the United States, but only on the best way of achieving that goal. The historic year of 1961 saw the formulation of political parties in the Mariana Islands District -- the first political parties in the Trust Territory. The Popular Party favoured integration with the present United States Territory of Guam and the Territorial Party desired direct, outright annexation by the United States. Since that time these two parties have remained strong, differing only in their emphasis from time to time. Their goals remained the same: membership in the United States political family.

All three referenda in the district, held in 1961, 1963 and 1969, showed that an overwhelming majority of our voters wanted close political ties with the United States.

Representatives of the district continued to play an important part in the deliberations of the Congress of Micronesia on the crucial issue of the future political status of our Trust Territory. In 1970, however, the ideological schism which separates our people from the people of the other districts became all too apparent and too pronounced to ignore any longer. The historic summer of 1970 saw the proposal by the United States of a new political status for Micronesia, one which very nearly reflected all the hopes and dreams of the people of the Marianas. Our people and our elected leaders believed that the so-called commonwealth offer should have been accepted. We were extremely disappointed when it was not. During that same historic session of the Congress, Micronesian law-makers gave a new and different direction to the future political status committee: the four principles and legal rights, including the proposal that the future relationship between the United States and Micronesia should be a "free association" the details of which would be spelled out

(Mr. Borja)

by a compact, a relationship which could be terminable unilaterally by either party. This principle was unacceptable to our delegation and to our people and inconsistent with all our goals and aspirations, with all we had come to know, to value and to cherish and with all our hopes and dreams.

The die was then cast; the schism grew unavoidably and inevitably wider. The 1970 elections saw the defeat of all congressional incumbents in the Marianas, including those who had favoured continued exploration of the idea of free association and remaining in unity with the rest of the Trust Territory. It also saw the passage by the Mariana Islands District Legislature of a resolution which stated that the people of the Marianas would resist the stripping of their desires for close political relationship with the United States "by force of arms, if necessary".

I once accepted the concept of free association with the United States. I firmly believed that the essential principles of free association, as I saw them, were written into the 1970 commonwealth offer. I spoke many times in the Congress that summer, strongly in favour of accepting that offer. But the Congress of Micronesia rejected it completely and proceeded to redefine the concept of "free association" by their four principles and legal rights to the point at which what was left was not free association at all but independence disguised as free association and to the point at which my people could no longer accept the position of the Congress and today are unable to foresee a future in political union with the other five districts of the Trust Territory.

As I noted during that 1970 session of the Congress, the people of the Marianas considered a close relationship with the United States to be a detour around the road block of political status which will release the energies of our people and turn them to the achievement of the deep, if less dramatic freedoms gained by self-reliance, education, security, economic fairness, administrative skill and productivity. Eventually it will bring forth the political status sired by the democratic institutions of the world. I believed then, as I do now, that under a relationship of close affiliation with the United States there is a great hope and a great future for the Marianas. There is hope for economic opportunities and prosperity; there is hope for the opportunity to live under a democratic system as free men, where our government is truly the servant of the people and responsive to their needs.

(Mr. Borja)

With the recent developments at Koror, it is apparent that when our remaining ties with the other five districts are finally dissolved we will indeed be completely separate. There are many -- including, I would presume, some of the members of this Council -- who would have wished otherwise. But we have come before this distinguished body this day in the hope that you will see that the continuation of our relationship with the remainder of Micronesia would be contrary to the best interests of all.

(Mr. Borja)

All the documents of the United Nations make it clear that the greatest right which men possess is the right to control their own political destiny. All of the great work of this Council has been directed towards assuring and protecting that right.

The United Nations Charter makes frequent reference to the right of self-determination as a corner-stone of its precepts. Article 73 b states that it is the obligation of United Nations Members which assume responsibility for Non-Self-Governing States:

"... to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples..."

Article 76 b reiterates this obligation with reference to the Administering Authorities of Trust Territories such as ours; article 6 (1) of our Trusteeship Agreement further reaffirms it. The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples makes it perfectly clear.

We have asked the United States for separate negotiations on our political future so that we, too, may exercise our fundamental right of self-determination. We want a government for our people which will reflect our desires. We want a Mariana Islands in political union with the United States of America. We earnestly hope that this Council fully understands our situation and will give its blessings to our efforts in attainment of these political goals and aspirations.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Vicente N. Santos to make a statement.

Mr. SANTOS: Thank you for giving me the opportunity and privilege of appearing before you to re-express the wishes of the people of the Mariana Islands District to develop a permanent association with the Administering Authority.

I am Vicente N. Santos, President of the District Legislature of the Marianas, an elected position I have held since 1963. My ancestors have lived in the Mariana Islands for many generations.

(Mr. Santos)

The Mariana District is one of six districts composing the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands that was unilaterally placed under the International Trusteeship System with the United States of America as the Administering Authority. My role here today is to acquaint this great international body with the efforts of the District Legislature to gain a permanent association with the United States of America.

I say re-express the political desires of the people because for nearly a decade the elected body representing the people of Rota, Tinian, Saipan and the Northern Islands, that make up the Mariana District, have been steadfast in their desire to develop a permanent association with the Administering Authority - the United States of America.

The most important single incentive for the expressions of the District Legislature over the last decade has been the change contained in Chapter XII, Article 76 b of the Charter of this Organization which states in part:

"... to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its people and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned..."

The indigenous peoples of the Marianas have not been unaware of the commendable efforts of the United Nations since its founding to advance the great cause of self-determination. People in every corner of the earth have been encouraged and supported in their efforts freely to determine their own fate. We believe this Council will see the wisdom of our requests and continue this great tradition and support the freely expressed wishes of the Marianas to develop a non-Trustee relationship with the United States of America.

Quite frankly, we want to be included in what future historians will call "the era of self-determination".

Our desire for permanent association with the United States has a historical basis which I want briefly to call to your attention. The Treaty of Paris ending the Spanish-American war contained a "historical accident" which

(Mr. Santos)

separated the indigenous peoples of Rota, Saipan and Tinian from their historical economic, cultural, religious and common language ties with Guam. For 350 years prior to that treaty these islands had a common history under the administration of Spain. This accident of history which separated the indigenous peoples was perpetuated in the twentieth century by the League of Nations and later by the United Nations when it created the Trusteeship Agreement with the United States in 1947.

We are here today to advise this Council that our people have on many, many occasions expressed their desire to correct this error of history. In 1969, for example, pursuant to a petition of the Mariana Islands District Legislature, a special poll was held on a district-wide basis. This plebiscite set out a series of choices for the people and after full and free discussions all registered voters were asked to cast a secret ballot. The result confirmed the fact that the majority of the people want a permanent association with the United States of America. A copy of the result of this plebiscite is included as Exhibit A. Since 1969, numerous village town-hall type meetings have been held throughout the District and they reconfirm and in fact more strongly indicate the desire of the people for permanent association with the Administering Authority.

In addition to the plebiscite results, the records of this honourable body will show that since the creation of the Mariana Islands District Legislature in 1963, the people of the Mariana Islands District have expressed their political desire to become a permanent part of the Administering Authority.

Resolution 2 (1963), passed on 5 August 1963, requested the Administering Authority to conduct a plebiscite on the political future of the Mariana Islands District and to designate 24 October 1963 for that purpose.

Resolution 3 (1963) also passed on 5 August 1963, requested the Administering Authority to reconsider the petition requesting the reunification of the Mariana Islands.

Resolution 22 (1964), passed on 10 February 1964, requested this body, the Trusteeship Council, to reconsider the petition under resolution 7 that was enacted by the Saipan Municipal Legislature, relative to the reintegration of the Mariana Islands, directly under the Doctrine of Human Rights, and in

(Mr. Santos)

consonance with the objective of the United Nations policy in the international Declaration of Human Rights.

Resolution 6 (1965), passed on 6 August 1965, requested the Administering Authority and the United States Congress to grant United States citizenship to the inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Resolution 43 (1965), passed on 19 August 1965, requested the United States Congress to consider favourably changing the political status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Resolution 56 (1965), passed on 23 August 1965, requested the Legislature of the Territory of Guam to request the United States Congress to amend the Organic Act of the Territory of Guam to extend the boundaries of that United States Territory to include the islands of the Mariana Islands District.

Resolution 4 (1967), passed on 10 February 1967, requested this body, the Trusteeship Council, to urge the Administering Authority to take concrete steps to prepare the people for self-determination and to set a deadline for a plebiscite in the Mariana Islands District.

Resolution 43 (1967), passed on 28 August 1967, requesting the Administering Authority to approve the reunification of the Mariana Islands District with the United States Territory of Guam.

Resolution 8 (1967), passed on 10 February 1967, requested this body to urge the Administering Authority to relax immigration restrictions and permit free entry of inhabitants of the Mariana Islands District into the United States.

Resolution 7 (1967), passed on 10 February 1967, requested the Administering Authority to unify the Mariana Islands District with the Territory of Guam as a Territory of the Marianas in consonance with the objective of the United Nations policy under the Declaration of Human Rights.

(Mr. Santos)

Resolution No. 4 - 1968, passed on 19 January 1968, requesting the Administering Authority to grant United States citizenship to the people of the Mariana Islands District and to permit the reunification of the Mariana Islands District with the Territory of Guam.

Resolution No. 8 - 1967, passed on 10 February 1967, requested this honourable body to urge the Administering Authority to relax immigration restrictions and permit free entry of inhabitants of the Mariana Islands District into the United States.

Resolution No. 7 - 1967, passed on 10 February 1967, requested the Administering Authority to unify the Mariana Islands District with the Territory of Guam as a Territory of the Marianas in consonance with the objective of the United Nations policy under the Declaration of Human Rights.

Resolution No. 4 - 1968, passed on 19 January 1968, requested the Administering Authority to grant United States citizenship to the people of the Mariana Islands District and to permit the reunification of the Mariana Islands District with the Territory of Guam.

Resolution No. 27 - 1969, passed on 26 February 1969, created a Select Committee to continue the study of the reunification of the Mariana Islands District within the governmental framework of the Territory of Guam and of the methods available for bringing about such reunification.

Resolution No. 13 - 1969, passed on 25 August 1969, authorized the President of the Mariana Islands District Legislature to appoint a Plebiscite Committee to hold public meetings throughout the Mariana Islands District to explain to the people the purposes of the district-wide plebiscite to be held in November, 1969.

Resolution No. 13 - 1970, passed on 18 February 1970, requested this honourable body to effect the immediate reunification of the Mariana Islands District with the Territory of Guam as is envisioned under the Doctrine of Human Rights, and in consonance with the objectives of the United Nations adherence to its International Declaration of Human Rights.

Resolution No. 12 - 1970, passed on 21 August 1970, endorsed the proposal of the Administering Authority to establish a Commonwealth of Micronesia and urged that the Administering Authority submit that Commonwealth proposal to the people of the Mariana Islands District for endorsement and to proceed with its implementation in the Marianas until the people of the other districts are ready to decide their future political status.

(Mr. Santos)

Resolution No. 11 - 1970, passed on 20 August 1970, extended an invitation to the Administering Authority to meet and discuss with the Mariana Islands District Legislature the proposal to establish a Commonwealth of Micronesia.

Resolution No. 13 - 1970, passed on 24 August 1970, requested this honourable body to recognize the cultural differences between the districts of the Trust Territory and to allow each district to choose its own political future.

Resolution No. 30 - 1971, passed on 19 February 1971, advised the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations that the Mariana Islands District will secede from the Trust Territory by force of arms if necessary.

These resolutions clearly manifest the deep-seated wishes of our people to seek their desired future political determination that we are confident will be achieved, hopefully with the blessings of this honourable body, whose assistance to the inhabitants of the Trust Territory has been of immeasurable proportions.

The underlying fact expressed in the resolutions mentioned above is the desire of the Marianas peoples to belong.

Our history is one of third parties deciding our fate. One need only review our history of control by the Spanish from the sixteenth century; the Germans from 1898 to 1923; the Japanese (League of Nations) from 1923 to 1947; and the United States (United Nations) from 1947 to the present, to understand that we long now to belong on our terms and in accordance with our freely expressed wishes. There is no doubt in my mind that great economic, social and educational developments will take place if we are successful in gaining permanent association with the United States of America.

In furtherance of this manifested desire, the Mariana Islands District Legislature has enacted a law that would provide for the establishment of the Marianas Future Political Status Commission. Permit me to insert this law and resolution No. 1-1972, into the record for the Council's review and information.

On behalf of our people of the Mariana Islands District, I wish to again express our deep and sincere appreciation to the members of this honourable body for all of its assistance and understanding.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on any members of the Council who wish to put questions to the petitioners.

Mr. ASHWIN (Australia): I do not think any member of this Council is not well aware, from the statements we have heard today and from the statements that the Council has heard in many previous years, of the strength of the wishes of the Marianas people. At the same time, I am sure that members of the Council also feel to some degree uneasy about this situation. It is a problem that confronts the world and the United Nations continuously -- that is, the problem of a part of an existing political organization that wants to achieve separation. There is certainly no virtue in holding a political organization together just for the sake of holding it together when a section of it wishes to leave. What is important is the manner of the separation, the way it is achieved.

I come to my question. Senator Amaraich yesterday, as the petitioners from the Marianas no doubt heard, raised the issue of the role of the Congress of Micronesia in relation to this question, and I note from the list of resolutions that President Santos has read out to us that they are all directed either to the Trusteeship Council or to the Administering Authority. But I see no resolutions directed to the Congress of Micronesia. My question therefore is, what efforts has the District Legislature made, particularly in the period since the third round of joint status negotiations, to enter into formal discussions with the Congress of Micronesia to attempt to get the Congress' agreement to your negotiating separately with the United States?

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Pangelinan.

Mr. PANGELINAN: I should like to respond to that question. As the members of the Council will recall, the Congress of Micronesia was established in 1965. Prior to that time there was no Congress of Micronesia. Consequently, most of the earlier resolutions were directed either to this body or to the United States Government. At the present time we do have one resolution which has directed its concern not only to this Council but also to the United States Government as well as to the Congress of Micronesia, endorsing the statement of position transmitted to the United States delegation by members of the Marianas

(Mr. Pangelinan)

delegation in the Joint Committee of Future Status, which in essence expressed the desire of the people for permanent association with the United States and for an opportunity to negotiate on this matter.

During the time that I have been a member of the Joint Committee on Future Status, the Mariana Islands District Legislature has given us the opportunity, as the highest elected officials, to express the interest not only of the District Legislature but of the people of the Marianas throughout the district, and we have been expressing this interest to the Joint Committee on Future Status and to the Congress of Micronesia.

Mr. ASHWIN (Australia): Could I ask then, have the Mariana members of the Joint Committee on Future Status in fact used the opportunities of the third and fourth round of negotiations with the United States delegation as a forum to discuss with the other members of the Joint Committee on Future Status the procedures which should be used to achieve the objective they want, in an attempt to get a firm agreement, if not at this stage from the Congress, at least from the other members of the Joint Committee on Future Status?

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Pangelinan.

Mr. PANGELINAN: The members of the Marianas delegation in the Congress of Micronesia have -- at least for the past two years -- expressed the interests of the Marianas regarding future political status in relation to the United States of America. Unfortunately, the mandate of the Joint Committee is restricted and as such it has to work in the interests of the whole Territory and not of the separate districts. Consequently, we are at a disadvantage in expressing our sentiments without the benefit of having them expressed to the Administering Authority. There is, however, a note that was made in the third round of negotiations in Hana, Maui, where the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Future Status, Senator Salii, said that the people of the Marianas aspired to become a part of the United States. Also, in the last special session of the Congress of Micronesia, Senator Salii noted that any discussion on political status should also entail the special interests of individual districts and we have been expressing this interest to the Joint Committee. Unfortunately again, the Joint Committee has a mandate which restricts its discussion to the Territory as a whole. During the fourth round of the negotiations, in Koror, Palau, we transmitted a request to the Joint Committee and the Joint Committee made it very specific that we had to get permission from the Congress. The members of the Joint Committee, however, voted that we could present our special interests to the United States delegation, and we did present a statement of position.

Mr. ASHWIN (Australia): I should like to follow that up with just one more question. I found that last statement most interesting. Have the Marianas members of the Congress of Micronesia ever consulted, within the last year, with the other members in an attempt to obtain legislation in the Congress of Micronesia authorizing the Marianas District to go ahead and negotiate in that way?

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Pangelinan.

Mr. PANGELINAN: Yes; during the last regular session, in January, we called the attention of the Joint Committee on Future Status to legislation authorizing the Mariana Islands District to negotiate separately. That request was delayed for consideration by members. It was hoped that during the last negotiation the matter would be taken up for consideration again. Unfortunately,

(Mr. Pangelinan)

the matter was rejected, again on the ground that the Joint Committee had no authority to speak on behalf of the Mariana Islands representatives. We take the position in the Marianas that the nature of political matters arises from the United Nations Charter as well as the Trusteeship Agreement. For that reason, we have taken the initiative to present our aspirations directly to this body, which made possible the Trusteeship Agreement for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. WEIR (United Kingdom): I should like to ask for clarification of the last reply. Was the petitioner saying that the Marianas had in fact taken up this question in the Congress of Micronesia or in the Joint Status Committee? And if it was in the Congress that the suggestion was rejected, have they the intention of taking it up again there?

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Guerrero.

Mr. GUERRERO: Ever since Senator Pangelinan and I joined the Congress Committee on Future Status in 1970 and were duly appointed by our Marianas delegation to that status, we have been working through the Joint Committee of the Congress on Political Future. As my colleague has pointed out, prior to the negotiations in October 1971 in Hawaii we advised the Congress Status Committee of the long-standing aspiration of the people of the Marianas to belong to the United States administration. Again on 11 February 1972, during the regular session of the Congress of Micronesia, we were prepared to introduce legislation requesting the Congress of Micronesia to recognize the outstanding position of the Marianas District. We have recognized our obligation as members of the Status Commission in working with the Joint Committee on Future Status, having received a mandate from the Congress on the negotiation of the political future of the Trust Territory. We have submitted for the consideration of the Commission -- and hopefully for transmission to the Congress -- the official position of the Mariana Islands District. Unfortunately, the Joint Committee on Future Status felt it would not be possible to enact legislation of the kind we have been working for. During the recent Koror, Palau, negotiations in April of this year, we again formally requested our Joint Committee on Future Status to present on behalf of

(Mr. Guerrero)

our people the aspirations of the peoples of the Marianas. They decided that this was outside their jurisdiction, but they authorized the representatives of the Marianas in the Joint Committee on Future Status formally to present the petition of the Marianas to the United States delegation, and we accordingly did so on 11 April 1972.

Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In his statement Senator Olympio Borja said that disagreement between the representatives of the Marianas and the other delegations in the Congress of Micronesia was particularly acute in 1970 -- in other words, after the delegation of the Congress of Micronesia had rejected the proposal of the United States to solve the problem of the future political status of the Territory of the Pacific Islands on the basis of a so-called commonwealth. We should like to seek clarification. Would it be correct to assume that the present demands of the representatives of the Marianas can be explained by the fact that the delegation of the Congress of Micronesia rejected the proposal of the United States and demanded self-determination on the basis of the well-known four principles?

Mr. BORJA: I would say that it is correct to make that assumption because of the fact that the Congress of Micronesia completely rejected the proposal made by the United States delegation for a form of commonwealth. Thereafter, instead of adopting that proposal the Congress of Micronesia went ahead and asserted as its mandate the same four principles of legal rights that had been unacceptable to the people of the Marianas.

Specifically, under the terms of the proposal, the compact would be made on a revocable basis and could be terminated unilaterally. This is the point that the people of the Marianas consider entirely unacceptable, because while we do want to have closer association and stronger ties with the United States, we do not want there to be the possibility of termination without the consent of both parties, and we do not wish to have a revocable compact. We would like to have something that would give assurance, security, permanency and stability to our Government. For this reason we are at this time advocating closer ties, and it is correct to assume that it was the denial of commonwealth status by the Congress of Micronesia that made the Marianas people come to this Council and present this petition.

Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Does that mean that the Marianas delegation fully accepts the proposals of the United States delegation regarding the future political status of Micronesia; or are there any dissensions with the view held by the United States delegation or with the original proposals made by the United States?

Mr. BORJA: I would say at the outset that the original proposal made by the United States is not really completely satisfactory to the delegation of the Marianas or to its people -- the 11 points which the Congress of Micronesia first requested and which were put into commonwealth form. But I would say that we could go ahead and retain that proposal of the United States delegation and the Congress of Micronesia worked together to polish it up so that some of the problems we may have with the commonwealth proposal could be reduced to the extent that the proposal would be satisfactory to the people. We feel that that commonwealth proposal is much better than any other proposal that has been presented.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): The reports which have been submitted indicate that the district legislatures deal with important matters such as alcohol control and questions of inheritance, land and domestic matters. I do not see any heading regarding the conditions for the secession of a district. Perhaps the petitioners could explain how they have found in these provisions regarding land tenure and alcohol an open door for the creation of a committee which is to negotiate on the future of the Territory, since to negotiate on the future of a part of the Territory means, in fact, to negotiate on the future of the whole Territory.

Mr. PANGELINAN: That question is most difficult for us to respond to at this time. However, I would just like to mention that we are working toward the ultimate termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, and after that we will be entering into separate status. At the present time we take the position that if we have to work toward one status for the whole Territory and overlook the fact that one district has a very diverse aspiration, and do not give it an opportunity to present its case, we would be defeating the whole purpose of negotiation.

In the Marianas we are working towards the future termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, with the hope that as the five districts of the Trust Territory proceed towards negotiating their status we will also have the opportunity to negotiate our status so that in the event the Trusteeship Agreement is terminated we will know what we are entering into.

I do not know whether I have responded adequately to the question of the representative of France.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): It might be premature to ask the petitioners whether they have studied in substance a matter which for the time being is the subject only of discussions; but I assume that since they are interested in this problem, and have been for a number of years, they have some ideas on this subject. I am referring particularly to the economic effects of secession, particularly on their own district. I am interested in other districts as well, but I imagine that they must have examined this question of the economic situation that would

(Mr. Blanc, France)

result from such a secession of their own Territory, the District of the Marianas. Perhaps they could give us whatever information they have on this matter.

Mr. PANGELINAN: We have considered all the ramifications involved in a political secession. At the present time we are not seceding; we are asking for the opportunity to negotiate with the United States of America for separate status upon termination of the Trusteeship Agreement; I would hope that this is understood by members of the Trusteeship Council. But we would also like to advise the members of the Council that unless we are given the opportunity to negotiate separately, we shall not know what kind of status we would be entering into, and that is the problem we share at the present time.

We also believe that economic stability is very much correlated with political stability, and that, as we said in our statement of position, economics and politics should be considered jointly. I am afraid that the Joint Committee at the present time is not cognizant of the special interests of the people of the Marianas, or of their aspirations; and the problem of the lack of authorization by the Congress has been a stumbling block in presenting our aspirations to the Congress of Micronesia. For this reason, we are bringing them before the United Nations.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): A moment ago Mr. Guerrero referred to a 1971 report. We had heard about the referendum of 1969, but I do not recall having seen any details about the 1971 report. Could he shed some light on this matter?

Mr. GUERRERO: I am afraid I may have given the wrong impression that there was a plebiscite conducted in 1971. If I did, I apologize to the representative of France. I did not intend to say that there was any plebiscite conducted in 1971. The most recent plebiscite in the Marianas District on its political future was in November 1969.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): I have not referred to a plebiscite, and I think Mr. Guerrero referred to a report, not a plebiscite. I should simply like to know how that report was established and by whom and what its results and conclusions were.

Mr. GUERRERO: The report to which I have referred is the record of the plebiscite held on 9 November 1969, which indicates that those in favour of reintegration with the United States Territory of Guam totalled 1,942. I was merely referring to that report.

The survey of 1971 to which I referred in my report was conducted by my colleague Senator Pangelinan and myself as members of the Status Committee of the Congress of the Marianas. We toured all the islands of the Marianas and all their inhabited districts and came up with the record that the people of those districts wanted a close affiliation with the United States.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): That is the reply I wanted. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to thank the petitioners on behalf of the Council.

The petitioners withdrew.

The PRESIDENT: Following its decision of this morning, the Council will complete the questioning period at its meeting tomorrow morning. It will also hear further petitioners who may arrive from the Trust Territory. In addition, the Council will consider all communications and written petitions to which I referred this morning. If there are no comments on this plan for tomorrow's meeting, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.